





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2020 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

<https://archive.org/details/Boothroyd1968>

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

AN EXPERIMENT IN TEACHING AS DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP

by



PETER BOOTHROYD

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

DATE: OCTOBER 25, 1968

THESIS
1968(F)
15

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and
recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a
thesis entitled "An Experiment in Teaching as Democratic
Leadership" submitted by Peter Boothroyd in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

ABSTRACT

In three experimental classes in introductory sociology at the University of Alberta, teaching was conducted as democratic leadership. The classes continued for seven months - a full "academic year". All decisions were left in the hands of the students after the classes were established. The first class involved 15 students in the Faculty of Arts; the second, 17 students in the Faculty of Education; and the third, 16 students from the Science, Household Economics and Physical Education Faculties. All students were in their first year of university and had come directly from high school. One half of each class was composed of girls.

The purpose of the experiment was to understand the processes which developed in the democratic classes, and from this understanding to raise more general questions about the process of learning.

The proceedings of each class are described, session by session, and the students' reactions to the classes are tabulated and analyzed. Four categories were employed to analyze the data: teaching approach, structure of course, classroom interaction and substantive content.

It was found that with regard to each of these categories certain tensions were evident in all three classes. These dimensions were: involvement versus detachment by the teacher, organization versus spontaneity of structure, vigorous debate versus widespread participation as styles of interaction, and the learning of facts versus the sharing of opinions. Because of different events and different

personalities in each class, there were different initial tendencies exhibited in terms of each of these tensions. However, when a class tended toward one pole of a dimension, it always exhibited a counter-vailing tendency toward the other pole. That is to say, the teacher felt a need to be both detached and involved, and the classes felt the need to be both organized and spontaneous, to both engage in vigorous debate and develop widespread participation, to both learn facts and share opinions.

These findings suggest that one can indeed trust the students in a democratic class. They will develop their class in directions which meet complementary social and intellectual needs. It is proposed that these felt needs are common to all learning groups.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The thesis committee helped me very much. I came to rely on my adviser, Professor Robert Hughes, as a person with whom I could discuss numerous methodological problems and tentative substantive ideas throughout the year. Doctor Charles Hobart provided continual encouragement and help in developing the key questions of study. Professor Roger Wade also gave generously of his time in talking with me about the thesis. Professor Kenneth Cunningham, my advisor before he took leave, was instrumental in having established the sections of introductory sociology on which this thesis is based. Professor William Meloff provided technical advice and help in using the small groups laboratory. The Department of Sociology at the University of Alberta is to be thanked for its patience and willingness to allow the experiment to be carried on under its auspices. Ruth McKeown did an excellent job of typing under trying circumstances.

For the experience on which the thesis is based, I have good reason to thank every student who participated in the experimental classes. Apart from their cooperation in allowing their discussions to be taped and in answering questionnaires, their ideas and questions helped me think through some of my own questions about the study. On many topics, they helped me learn a great deal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the study	1
Purpose of the study	2
Criteria for democratic leadership	4
Plan of the thesis	5
II. REVIEW OF RELEVANT RESEARCH	7
III. METHODOLOGY	25
Conception of the experiment	25
Sources of the data	26
Organization of the data	27
Analysis of the data	29
Composition of the experimental class	29
Meeting times of the experimental class	31
Initial decisions on teaching approach	31
IV. PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL CLASSES	36
Introduction	36
Description of proceedings	
Arts Class	37
Period 1	37
Period 2	52
Period 3	59
Period 4	64
Education Class	67
Period 1	67
Period 2	82
Period 3	91
Period 4	99
Mixed Class	103
Period 1	103
Period 2	114
Period 3	118
Period 4	125
Analysis of proceedings	130
Period 1	130
Arts Class	130
Education Class	132
Mixed Class	135
Comparison of classes	136

	Page
Period 2	139
Arts Class	139
Education Class	140
Mixed Class	142
Comparison of classes	144
Period 3	146
Arts Class	146
Education Class	149
Mixed Class	150
Comparison of classes	151
Period 4	153
Arts Class	153
Education Class	154
Mixed Class	156
Comparison of classes	157
Summary	159
Teaching Approach	159
Structure of Course	160
Classroom Interaction	161
Substantive Content	163
Conclusion	164
V. STUDENTS' EVALUATIONS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL CLASSES	166
Introduction	166
Analysis of evaluations	174
Period 1	174
Arts Class	174
Education Class	180
Mixed Class	185
Period 2	191
Arts Class	191
Education Class	197
Mixed Class	205
Period 3	210
Arts Class	210
Education Class	214
Mixed Class	218
Period 4	222
Arts Class	222
Education Class	227
Mixed Class	230
Summary	232
General Attitude	232
Teaching Approach	233
Structure of Course	234
Classroom Interaction	235
Substantive Content	237

	Page
VI. CONCLUSIONS	240
Summary of findings	240
Arts Class	240
Education Class	241
Mixed Class	242
Comparison of classes	243
Implications for further research	246
Suggestions for further research	248
BIBLIOGRAPHY	252
APPENDIX A: ANALYSIS OF SUBSTANTIVE CONTENT	254
APPENDIX B: READING, ATTENDANCE, INTEREST IN SOCIOLOGY AND LEVEL OF VERBAL PARTICIPATION	270
APPENDIX C: LEVEL OF VERBAL PARTICIPATION AND LOCATION OF HIGH SCHOOL	275
APPENDIX D: REACTIONS TO THE EXPERIMENT	277
APPENDIX E: EXAMINATIONS AND GRADES	280
APPENDIX F: COMPARISONS OF STUDENTS IN THE EXPERIMENTAL CLASSES AND STUDENTS IN A TRADITIONAL CLASS	283
APPENDIX G: EPILOGUE: CONTINUATION OF EXPERIMENTAL CLASSES	293

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
5:1	Percentage of each class expressing type of general attitude toward course by period of year covered by questionnaire.	169
5:2	Percentage of each class referring to teaching approach by type of comment and period of questionnaire.	170
5:3	Percentage of each class referring to structure of course by type of comment and period of year covered by questionnaire.	171
5:4	Percentage of each class referring to classroom interaction by type of comment and period of year covered by questionnaire.	172
5:5	Percentage of each class referring to substantive content of course by type of comment and period of year covered by questionnaire.	173
A:1	Dates, and nature of occasions, during period of year covered by first questionnaire, on which specified sociology topics were considered, by class.	255
A:2	Dates, and nature of occasions, during period of year covered by second questionnaire, on which specified sociology topics were considered, by class.	259
A:3	Dates, and nature of occasions, during period of year covered by third questionnaire, on which specified sociology topics were considered, by class.	262
A:4	Dates, and nature of occasions, during period of year covered by fourth questionnaire, on which specified sociology topics were considered, by class.	266
A:5	Total number of sessions in which various sociology topics were discussed, by class.	269
B:1	Summary of reports from each class on reading, attendance and interest in sociology, by period of year covered by questionnaire.	273

Table		Page
B:2	Percentage of each class making specific responses regarding attendance and verbal participation in class.	274
C:1	Number of students at each level of verbal participation who attended high school in urban or rural area, by class.	276
D:1	Percentage of each class stating that small groups laboratory, questionnaires, or fact of the experiment itself had specified effects on them.	279
E:1	Percentage of each class assigning self specific mark and making specific comment about mark.	282
F:1	Size of samples of students from experimental class and students from traditional class.	287
F:2	Mean student ratings of respective classes, by specific groups, on 5-point scale; (from 5 for "liked class very much" to 1 for "disliked class very much")	288
F:3	Mean student ratings of general academic work, by specific groups, on 5-point scale; (from 5 for "liked it very much" to 1 for "disliked it very much")	288
F:4	Mean numbers of courses in which less work done than in Sociology, by specific groups.	289
F:5	Mean numbers of classes missed in sociology, by specific groups.	289
F:6	Mean number of books relating to sociology read during the year, by specific groups.	290
F:7	Proportion of students planning to take future sociology course, by specific groups.	290
F:8	Number of students "thinking about majoring in sociology," by specific groups.	291
F:9	Number of students stating that this year of university has resulted in a broader outlook in life, by specific groups.	291

Table		Page
F:10	Numbers of students who would advise future students in same class to get involved, by specific groups.	292
G:1	Percentage of each class returning for second year of experimental course.	295

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Background of the study

A discussion of the origins of this study should start with the experience of the writer during four years of undergraduate work in geography at the University of Toronto. Increasingly, during these four years, I came to feel disgusted with my learning environment. I found that I, and most of my fellows, saw the whole program as a game in which we tried to outwit the faculty and in which they tried to pretend that the program was inspiring. While I felt disgusted, I also felt helpless before such a mammoth institution. I was unable to articulate to myself the nature of the problem, much less its sources. (I graduated one year before the first big Berkeley uprising.)

After receiving my degree, I spent two years working full-time in the Canadian peace movement. During these two years, I began analyzing the university system with the help of co-workers, and thus began understanding the rest of the frustration I had felt while attending university. Conversely I experienced a new learning environment in which people were encouraged to discuss questions rather than memorize points; in which emphasis was placed on the responsibility of those with the more articulated ideas to communicate through dialogue; in which discussion focussed on the concerns of all, not only the concerns of the most articulate. I was impressed with the difference between the amount of learning I had experienced in university and that which

I experienced in the peace movement.

When as a graduate student I entered the Department of Sociology at the University of Alberta, I determined to build into my own teaching responsibilities the conditions for learning which I had found most fruitful. I spent one year as a seminar leader for an introductory course in sociology, and was gratified by the results of my democratic leading of the seminars - limited as democracy could be in such circumstances. At the same time I was inspired by my first reading of A. S. Neill's Summerhill,¹ and by my introduction to the philosophy of the pragmatists. I became excited about the idea of implementing an experimental course which would be subject to far fewer external constraints and pressures than were these seminars.

During the academic year, 1967-68, I had the opportunity to teach three independent sections of introductory sociology under such conditions. I decided that I would attempt to teach these classes in a fully democratic manner, and that I would conduct research into the results and processes of the classes. This thesis is the report of the research.

Purpose of the study

Originally, I had planned to compare the "amount of sociology learned" in the experimental classes with the amount learned in a more conventional class. During the initial few months of the experiment, however, it became apparent that such an experimental design was inappropriate, for reasons explained in Chapter III. I redirected my interest to discovering what would happen when freshmen university

students from a typical North American high school system are given, and encouraged to accept, the responsibility for establishing their own topics and methods for study. Rather than attempting to ascertain how much of the knowledge which I presented or valued was learned, as is the nature of most educational experiments, I became concerned with reporting and analyzing what the students did and how they felt about this activity.

The research is exploratory, and in a formal sense no hypotheses are tested. The aim is to develop some of the questions and to formulate tentative answers about the process of learning on the basis of the data collected. The research is seen as an exercise in "discovering grounded theory."²

Apart from generating theory about the learning process, the research serves to identify some of the problems which arise in a democratic class. An understanding of these problems should help a person, be he teacher or student, participate more happily and effectively in future groups of this kind.

Although this thesis is not directed toward evaluating, in terms of some presumed objective or personal standards, the activities and feelings of the students in the experimental classes, the data are presented for readers to make their own evaluations, if they wish to do so. The writer agrees with Carol Rogers, that:

You can trust the student. You can trust him to desire to learn in every way which will maintain or enhance self; you can trust him to make use of resources which will serve this end; you can trust him to evaluate himself in ways which will make for self-progress; you can trust him to

grow, provided the atmosphere for growth is available to him.³

Criteria for democratic leadership

My conception of democratic leadership is basically that of Lewin's: that "all policies be a matter of group determination, encouraged and drawn out by the leader", and that "the leader attempt to be a member in spirit and in discussion but not perform much of the actual work."⁴ In practice, I conceived the role of democratic leader as involving three aspects: a) democratic chairman facilitating, but not dominating, the decision-making activities of the group--he may decide to relinquish this role, or it might be taken away from him; b) resource person--i.e. a mature scholar who presumably has more facts, and perhaps insights, (relevant to the initial terms of reference of the learning group) than do other members of the learning group; c) mature person providing emotional support and indicating acceptance, (although not necessarily agreement) of all ideas and feelings in order that the other members of the group will feel freer to participate in both the decision-making and substantive discussions. I make no distinction among the terms democratic teaching, non-directive teaching, and student-centred teaching. However I prefer the first term because of its connections to larger issues.

If the goal of democratic leadership is to encourage full and honest participation by all members of a group, then the size of the group is of key importance. What the optimum size is for a democratic learning group is a moot point, and one which is not considered in this thesis. However, there seems to be common agreement that groups which

involve many more than 20 members are less effective than those which involve fewer than 20 members. Accordingly, the groups on which this study is based averaged 16 members each.

Plan of the thesis

After the chapter reviewing the research conducted on experimental learning groups, and the chapter explaining the design of the experiment described in this thesis, there are two chapters presenting and analyzing the data collected. The first of these chapters describes and analyzes the proceedings of the experimental classes. The second of the chapters first presents, in tabular form, the students' evaluations of the classes, then analyzes these data in terms of the historical description of the classes presented in the previous chapter. The final chapter summarizes the findings of the study and suggests certain questions arising from these findings which should be worth pursuing.

In the first five appendices, I have included miscellaneous additional information on the experimental classes. Appendix F compares the responses to a final questionnaire by students in the experimental classes with the responses of 36 students who were taught in a traditional class. The final appendix is a brief report on the continuation of the experimental classes in the following year.

FOOTNOTES

¹A. S. Neill, Summerhill, (New York: Hart Publishing Company, 1960).

²Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss, The Discovery of Grounded Theory, (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967).

³Carl R. Rogers, Client - Centred Therapy, (Boston: Houghton Muffin Company, 1951), p. 427.

⁴Kurt Lewin, Resolving Social Conflicts, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949), pp. 75-76. Here Lewin is discussing the experiments of R. Lippitt and R. K. White.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELEVANT RESEARCH

Introduction

In this chapter, the early experiments of Lippitt and White are first described. They were the forerunners of experiments on democratic groups conducted during the last three decades. Lewin, Lippitt and White introduced to social scientists some of the basic distinctions between authoritarian and democratic small groups, and first researched the respective impacts of such groups on the people in them.

A review of three types of research into democratic learning groups (or as they have usually be called, "student-centered", classes) makes up the remainder of this chapter. The first type was prevalent during the 1940's and 1950's. This was research conducted, mostly by educational psychologists, to determine the extent to which democratic teaching is an improvement over traditional teaching, in terms of the students' performances on certain kinds of tests--mostly academic and socio-emotional. This type of research has, it seems, virtually been neglected during the last decade. This is probably due to the fact that it was finally concluded from this research that the more democratic the teaching, the more socio-emotional growth by students, the more insight gained into social-psychological principles, but the less learning of facts. These experiments, it should be noted, were all conducted with students in psychology, or closely related courses.

Later studies of democratic teaching have been of two types :

1) by people who have been interested in developing democratic teaching for their own pedagogical reasons and who have kept notes of their attempts; 2) by sociologists and social-psychologists who are interested in understanding the developmental processes in groups and who employ for these purposes somewhat democratic learning groups. Unfortunately, reports on the first of these two types of research are very sketchy, although they are evocative and concerned with the same questions as this thesis. Research of the second type is not directed toward the basic question asked in this study: how and what do people learn in a fully democratic class. The first type of study has been conducted with classes in the humanities, the second with classes in "social relations".

Review of relevant research

The classic study of democratic leadership was the experiment of R. Lippitt. Comparing the effects of authoritarian and democratic forms of leadership on groups of children ten and eleven years old, he found that :

There was thirty times as much hostile domination in the autocracy, as in the democracy, more demands for attention and much more hostile criticism; whereas in the democratic atmosphere cooperation and praise of the other fellow was much more frequent. In the democracy more constructive suggestions were made and a matter-of-fact or submissive behaviour of member to

member was more frequent.

. . . Statements which were "we-centered" occurred twice as often in the democracy as in the autocracy, whereas far more statements in the autocracy were "I-centered" than in the democracy . . . In the autocratic group the children were less matter-of-fact, less co-operative and submissive toward their equals, but more submissive to their superiors than in the democracy.¹

A later study by R. Lippitt and R. K. White, (in which the effect of laissez-faire leadership was also studied,) bore out the findings of Lippitt. It showed further that there were "two types of reaction in the autocratic group, one characterized by aggression, the second by apathy."² In connection with this same experiment, one student in the autocratic group was exchanged with one student in the democratic group. Lewin notes that:

The change from autocracy to democracy seemed to take somewhat more time than from democracy to autocracy. Autocracy is imposed upon the individual. Democracy he has to learn.³

While these experiments of Lippitt and White were carried out with groups of a certain size, with children of a certain age, and with limited replication, they have instigated a great deal of further research on the differences between democratic and not-so-democratic groups.

Some of this research has been concerned with the affects of democratic learning groups on the students' learning.

During the 1940's and early 1950's, there was a spate of experiments on the effects of democratic leadership in university classrooms. Shifting from the focus of Lewin, Lippitt and White, which was on the group processes and the relations between the leader and the led, these studies were generally concerned with finding ways of teaching which were more effective according to certain criteria. The experiments varied greatly in the degree of democracy allowed in the classroom.

The first major study of this kind was Faw's in 1946.⁴ He taught a general psychology class consisting of 2 hours of lectures and 2 hours of discussion groups, for each student. The discussion groups were of three kinds: recitation-drill, student-centered, and one in which the two approaches were alternated weekly. In the student-centered group, the "instructor did not express his own views, nor did he answer questions directed at him". All groups of students wrote the same examinations. The students in the student-centered discussion groups learned more, according to these tests, than the students in the conventional group. However, they apparently felt that they would have learned more in the other type of discussion group. These students also said that they had gained more "social and emotional" value from this approach. In discussing this experiment Carl Rogers says:

The most serious flaw in his study is this role-taking by the instructor. It seems very likely that the role closest to his own beliefs and convictions would be most adequately implemented.⁵

In 1948, Schwebel and Asch conducted some exploratory research into the effects of student-centered teaching.⁶ They did not have a

control group to compare the experimental class with. Two Psychology of Adjustment classes and one General Psychology class were used for the experiment. They found that "the students who preferred the new method had read substantially more of the text and supplementary literature than those who opposed it." From their exploratory research, two hypotheses were formulated:

- 1) the the basic task in motivation is in stimulating the drive to growth and development, and
- 2) that the accomplishment of the student is directly related to the degree of freedom afforded him and his readiness to accept it.

In 1951, Asch undertook a more controlled experiment.

Presumably on the basis of the second hypothesis he had formulated with Schwbel, he gave the student-centered group, (which he was comparing with three traditional classes) almost complete freedom. There were readings "stipulated" at the beginning of the year, but the students were free to choose their own goals and to assign their own grades for the course. He was concerned with investigating "the value of the non-directive method in effecting changes in the students' intellectual, social and emotional adjustment." He discovered that the students in the non-directive class did more poorly on the final examination (which did not count for the students' grades) but that they felt that their class had "helped them to learn general psychology more effectively than did the students in the traditionally-structured class." He suggested that the students had a different concept of the subject matter of psychology from what had been tested for on the examination, that they had mastered less factual material, but were able - judging from the weekly reaction reports- to make more independent

decisions as a result of the class.

On the basis of a Bogardus Social-Distance Scale, Asch found that both the experimental and control groups had increased in general tolerance, and that on the basis of the Minnesota Multiphasic Inventory the control group improved to a greater extent in emotional adjustment.

Writing in 1951, Rogers reviewed the research in student-centered teaching which had been conducted up to that time.⁸ In addition to the studies discussed above, Rogers discussed a study by L. Gross of a class taught according to democratic principles and a class taught conventionally.⁹

Of Cantor's class, 62 per cent of the group had scale increases of 13 or more, while only 10 per cent of Doe's class showed such an increase . . . Gross concludes that Canter's method does encourage the development of self-insight on the part of the majority of students, though it may fail to reach a certain minority of every class.¹⁰

Rogers concludes his review of the experiments in student-centered teaching with the following methodological note:

It should be stressed, in considering these initial studies that 'student-centered' or 'non-directive' teaching is by no means defined in identical fashion by each investigator . . . Perhaps the only possible generalized description is that, as compared with the conventional college-level lecture course, there was much

greater permissiveness and freedom, and much more reliance upon the ability of the student to take responsibility for himself. As further studies are carried on, the objective description of the classroom climate and of the instructor's behaviour seems a necessary starting point for any investigation.¹¹

In 1954, W. J. McKeachie wrote an article reviewing the experiments in student-centered teaching which had been conducted up to that time.¹² He defined a student-centered class as having "higher degrees of one or more of:

- 1) student participation in goal setting
- 2) emphasis upon affective goals
- 3) student participation and student interaction
- 4) instructor's acceptance of inaccurate statements
- 5) group cohesiveness
- 6) ability to determine it's own fate
- 7) amount of time devoted to discussing personal experiences and problems."

In addition to discussing the experiments of Faw and Asch, he reports on four experiments reported between 1950 and 1952: those of Landsman,¹³ Smith and Johnson,¹⁴ Gibb and Gibb,¹⁵ and Kelley and Pepitone.¹⁶ The following is McKeachie's summaries of their reports:

Experimenting with a course in "Human Development, Adjustment and Learning", Landsman contrasted student-centered teaching with a less democratic method. From a battery of tests from the MMPI, to students' reactions, he found a significant difference between the two methods.

Smith and Johnson have found that student-centered teaching produces higher scores than instructor-centered teaching on tests of reasoning ability and creativity.

The research of Gibb and Gibb indicates that students from group-centered class which possessed many of the characteristics ordinarily called "student-centered" actually produced a growth in social skills in experimental instructions outside the classroom. Kelly and Pepitone found an increase of empathy in class which had been taught by student-centered methods. Efforts to produce such gains in instructor-centered class have been unsuccessful.

Intrigued by the contradictory findings of Faw and Asch with regard to the students' success on ordinary tests, and the disparate findings among other studies - a host of which apparently having been unpublished because no significant differences were found - McKeachie asked himself the following question:

Why has research on student-centered versus instructor-centered teaching seemed to lead up a blind alley?

One reason suggested for contradictory results is that different people have meant different things by student-centered. But a far more important reason is that we've been lumping together more variables than we could handle with our experimental designs . . . We need to work with a more limited number of variables and we need to relate these variables to the main body of psychological theory.

However, McKeachie found two reasons for hope:

. . . as compared with instructor-centered teaching, student centered-teaching results in little detriment to the learning of facts (provided the classes have textbooks and the tests are based on the texts.)

He saw two important variables which could be manipulated to obtain more exact results about student-centered teaching: the degree of student verbal participation which could be used as an independent variable by "varying opportunities for verbal participation or by

varying the percentage which the instructor rewards or accepts"; and the degree to which students feel able to influence their fate. Speaking in regard to latter variable, McKeachie concluded his article as follows.

It seems significant that almost everyone who tries student-centered teaching finds that the problems of grades presents the greatest obstacle to success. In addition, two studies (Gibb and Gibb and Smith and Johnson) which produce evidence of change as a result of student-centered teaching both reduced the power of the instructor by giving the group responsibility for determining grades . . .

If the instructor retains control of rewards, permissiveness with respect to means to the goal (such as assignments, classroom activities, etc.) may simply increase the ambiguity of the situation for the student and reduce student learning.

An article appeared later in 1954 by Guetzkow, Kelly and McKeachie, in which the variable of student participation was manipulated to produce three kinds of groups: recitation, discussion and group tutorial.¹⁷ These three kinds of groups were to parallel the authoritarian, democratic and laissez-faire types of groups studied by Lippitt and White. The authors were depressed to find that the students in the recitation group presented a superior performance on the final examination, that they had a greater interest in psychology, and that they enjoyed the course more. The authors concluded that the reason for this was that "the instrumental behaviours required were ones which almost all students have learned in their earlier schooling."

It is to be noted that in these three groups, the variable of

student control was not varied. An article by McKeachie in 1958 discusses a sequel to the experiment in which more power was given to the experimental group and in which there was more evaluative feedback to the students.¹⁸ There was more student-to-student interaction which was accounted for by the fact that "increased interaction counteracts the threat of reduced ability to depend on the teacher." This was deemed most important for dependent students. The findings were that there was no significant differences between the student-centered classes and the control groups, except in one respect: the students in the former classes developed more "insight into social dynamics".

In this same article, McKeachie reports on a study in which the students were given complete power in an experimental class.¹⁹ It was found that compared to a control group, the students in the student-centered class: a) felt that the course was more valuable than the other students; b) had greater interest in psychology than the other students; c) had developed more insight than the other students. In addition it was found that:

. . . the effect of giving students additional responsibility seemed to depend upon the students' readiness to accept responsibility . . . the researcher found that students who liked the experimental class and assumed responsibility were likely to be independent of traditional authority figures and high in need for achievement.

In what appears to be the last of this spate of articles dealing with the effects of student-centered teaching, Koenig and McKeachie report in 1959 on an experiment which proceeded on the following assumption:

Any teaching method is effective only for certain students; when we compare teaching methods on group measures, the effects upon different students cancel each other out.²⁰

They found that "students who fear failure, prefer familiar well-structured situations such as lectures." They also found differences in performance accounted for by sex, which fact they could not explain. They concluded with a recommendation that special training be provided for students who dislike independent work.

Summarizing the research conducted to determine the respective impacts of democratic and traditional classes on students' learning, we may say: 1) that all studies of this kind have been conducted using students in psychology, or closely related fields, as subjects; 2) that the degree of democracy or "student centeredness" has varied from almost complete control of the classes being left in the hands of the students to very little of the power being shared; 3) that this variable of degree of democracy has been a chief factor in determining outcomes in the experiments - a conclusion contrary to McKeachie's explicit words in his 1954 article, but consistent with the content in this article and with his own later research; 4) in particular, that the more democracy in the class, the more students develop emotionally and socially (in ways that are generally considered desirable,) the more they gain insight into social processes, but the less they learn facts taught in a usual introductory psychology course; 5) that some students, who "are independent of traditional authority figures and high in need for achievement" like, and assume responsibility in, democratic classes, while others who "fear failure" do not like

democratic classes; 6) that time is required for students accustomed to a traditional education system to adjust to a democratic classroom situation.

This writer has found no reports of research in student centered-teaching since 1959. In the last two years, however, there have been two reports by teachers in the humanities who conducted their classes along democratic lines for their own pedagogical interest. The first of these is by Moon who taught an introductory course in poetry which involved ten students.²¹ There were no examinations in the course, but there were six term papers "with deadlines and with suggested topics that might be narrowed or broadened as the students saw fit." A text was assigned. The students assigned their own grades. In discussing his journal of the classes Moon states

I was interested in three main themes, to which I repeatedly returned; what the students were learning about poetry, what was happening to the learning process in the classroom situation, and what my own role in the class should be.

There is little analysis of the proceedings beyond the following richly evocative excerpt from the author's conclusion:

It cannot be denied that systematic completeness in the students' learning was really missing, but this does not trouble me greatly. It is a natural thing for people to want system and completeness at some stage in their learning, but it does not seem to me that it is a really deep desire or need in the . . .

beginning stages, among students who are taking a first course in the subject. I feel sure that if kept in the atmosphere of courses of this kind long enough, they would naturally come to the point of needing system and would seek it out. The systematic ordering of experience is a natural part of learning, but it appears in rhythmical alteration with an open and free exploration of experience, the deep acquiring of experience. Clearly, the students in this course did not miss systematic completeness. Those who missed it are among my colleagues. What the students did get (undeniably and emphatically! and apparently because they in some way felt a need for it) was the feel of the subject and a real enthusiasm for it. This kind of course did not offer them an occasion for merely entertaining some ideas temporarily which I or someone else may have prescribed for them. Instead, it seems to have offered them a deeper experience, extremely rich in connotation and concrete texture of many kinds, but very difficult to articulate. It seems to have reached at least some of them on the level of the authentic self with its real needs and real responses.

I have, of course, a much stronger impression of my own experience in the course than of my students' experience. I could perhaps best characterize my own experience as a qualified success. My success is the students' success, and I have already discussed that; what I am concerned about now is a qualification of that success which I have felt in my own experience. There were times when I felt self-effaced, blanked out as a person, by my constant effort to reflect the thoughts and feelings of the others in the class.

The second recent report is by Duberman who taught a democratic class in History at Princeton.²² Duberman believed that:

. . . more than information could be exchanged when a permissive, non-judgemental atmosphere prevailed. Indeed, little important information can be transmitted if an emotional transaction is not simultaneously in process, for an individual will not expose his deepest assumptions nor be able to perceive those of another if their relationship is purely intellectual . . .

The chief function of a university should not be, as is currently assumed, the accumulation and dissemination of knowledge, but rather the encouragement of individual growth. Factual information must be made relevant to the individual's needs; it must pose some problems, extend some challenge, answer some longing, if it is to be incorporated rather than merely appended . . .

A seminar's structure must . . . remain flexible enough to register shifts in mood, and its climate permissive enough to allow individual variety in the approach and solution of problems. Some discipline is necessary to a coherent discussion, but it should not be imposed from above, but by the individual on himself when he senses that the group's collective need demands a shift in attitude and approach.

Duberman gave complete control of the class to the students although a series of topics was suggested at the beginning of the term. The class was divided into small groups of about 12 students. The grades were on a "pass fail" basis. Duberman was only slightly more explicit than Moon in analyzing the results of the class. The following is what he found.

With a single exception, the students admitted that they did less reading and studying in the seminar than they did in courses with assignments and grades. The confessional chorus was loud and long--lamentations of mea culpa generously interspersed with recriminations against a "system that feeds out worst impulses." A few students in their extremity, were reduced to suggesting as a remedy the very coercions against which they otherwise protested . . . They were excited by freedom and yet, because they failed by their own (perhaps excessively demanding) standards to fully grasp its opportunities, repelled by it . . .

The chief complaint in one group centered on what has been called "formlessness" or lack of direction". Only a minority viewed this as a deficiency, and no two people who did shared the same reasons for thinking so . . . This position . . . was sharply rebutted by the majority. They agreed that discussion frequently became generalized, unknowledgeable, and discursive, that the "bull-shit

quotient" was often high and that a "snarling five-man cacophony" often replaced thoughtful dialogue. But such "dysfunctions" are to be expected, they said are perhaps even necessary by-products of an alive atmosphere. Talk, by its very nature, is spasmodic, discursive, repetitive, even at times incoherent. To try to turn it into neat orderly packages is to drain it of life.

One last type of study which has been undertaken in the last several years should be briefly discussed here. A number of experiments have been carried out at Harvard University. Small classes in "Social Relations" are taught in a way which leaves much of the responsibility for the discussions with the classes themselves. However, readings and marks are assigned. The "leader" plays a very distinct and well-formulated role. The focus of these experiments is on group transformations, "interpersonal styles" and "member-leader relationships". The research is conducted both as participant-observation (or "clinical analysis",) and systematic observation. There is concern with the learning processes, but the case materials for discussion in the classes and the researchers' analyses tend to be psychoanalytic. More attention is paid to interaction in the classes rather than to content. There is relatively little attention paid to what the students are interested in learning, or to how and what they actually do learn. Nor is there any analysis of the leader's role, since it is fixed as a given.

Stages of group development have been analyzed in these experiments. For instance Mills analyzes five periods of the "life cycle of learning groups":²³

- 1) the encounter
- 2) testing boundaries and modelling roles

- 3) negotiating an indigenous normative system
- 4) production
- 5) separation

Mann redefines these five stages as: initial complaining, premature enactment, confrontation, internalization and separation and terminal review.²⁴ The last stage of the group has been of particular interest to these researchers, and Mann quotes Slater to the effect that: "the regressive quality of many of the final discussions . . . suggests the rearousal of earlier wishes for gratification in the nurturance and control areas."²⁵

In summary we should note that democratic or student-centered classes have been studied from three basic perspectives: that of the educational psychologists seeking to find the most effective ways of teaching; that of thoughtful teachers seeking to find ways of improving teaching as a humanizing function; that of sociologists and social psychologists seeking to discover the patterns of interaction in a group.

The research by the educational psychologists seems to have established that students in fully democratic classes develop more social-psychological insight and gain more in social development than do students in the usual lecture-type class. Only if the experimental classes are student-centered to a limited degree can students in such classes be meaningfully compared with students in a more traditional type of class. It appears that to the extent experimental classes are student-centered, students in these classes perform more poorly on traditional tests of subject matter mastery, than do students in traditional classes. On the other hand, to the extent that the classes

are student-centered the students will gain in social insight and development.

For the teacher concerned with imparting a certain amount of knowledge this fact produces tensions. Moon and Duberman have undercut this tension by stating their belief that education is worthwhile only to the extent that it is an experience which induces growth. They relegate the learning of subject matter to second place.

FOOTNOTES

¹Kurt Lewin, Resolving Social Conflicts, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948), p. 78.

²Ibid., p. 81.

³Ibid., p. 82.

⁴V. E. Faw, "A Psychotherapeutic Method of Teaching Psychology", American Psychologist, 1946, pp. 104-109.

⁵Carl Rogers, Client-Centered Therapy, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1951), p. 425.

⁶M. Schwebel and M. J. Asch, "Research Possibilities in Non-directed Teaching", Journal of Educational Psychology, 1948, pp. 359-369.

⁷M. J. Asch, "Nondirective Teaching in Psychology; A Study Based upon a Controlled Experiment", Psychological Monographs, No. 3, 1951.

⁸Rogers, op. cit., pp. 424-426.

⁹L. Gross, "An Experimental Study of the Validity of the Non-Directive Method of Teaching," Journal of Psychology, 1948, pp. 243-248.

¹⁰Rogers, op. cit., p. 424.

¹¹Ibid., p. 426.

- ¹²W. J. McKeachie, "Student-Centered vs. Instructor-Centered Instruction", Journal of Educational Psychology, 1954, pp. 143-150.
- ¹³T. Landsman, "An Experimental Study of a Student-Centered Learning Method," Unpublished doctor's dissertation, Syracuse University, 1952.
- ¹⁴H. C. Smith and O. M. Johnson, "An Experimental Study of Attitudes and Achievement in the Democratic Classroom". Paper read at 1952 meeting of American Psychological Association.
- ¹⁵Lorraine Gibb and J. Gibb, "The Effect of the Use of 'Participative Action' Groups in a course in General Psychology." Paper read at 1952 meetings of the American Psychological Association Abstract, American Psychologist, 1952, p. 247.
- ¹⁶H. Kelley and A. Pepitone, "An Evaluation of a College Course in Human Relations", Journal of Educational Psychology, 1952, pp. 193-209. This study is unique in the 1940's and 1950's in that measures are taken over time of the students' ability to analyse social interaction. It was found that insight increased continuously in these student-centered classes.
- ¹⁷H. Guetzkow, E.J. Kelly, and W. J. McKeachie, "An Experimental Comparison of Recitation, Discussion and Tutorial Methods in College Teaching, Journal of Educational Psychology, 1954, pp. 193-207.
- ¹⁸W. J. McKeachie, "Students, Groups and Teaching Methods," American Psychologist, 1958, pp. 580-584.
- ¹⁹J. A. Patton, "A Study of the Effects of Student Acceptance of Responsibility and Motivation on Course Behaviour". Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of Michigan, 1955.
- ²⁰Kathryn Koenig and W. J. McKeachie, "Personality and Independent Study", Journal of Educational Psychology, 1959, pp. 132-134.
- ²¹Samuel Moon, "Teaching the Self," Improving College and University Teaching, 1966, pp. 213-229.
- ²²Martin Duberman, "An Experiment in Education", Daedalus, (Winter,) 1966, pp. 318-341.
- ²³Theodore M. Mills, Group Transformation: An Analysis of a Learning Group, (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964).
- ²⁴Richard D. Mann et. al., Interpersonal Styles and Group Development, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1967).
- ²⁵P. Slater, Microcosm: Structural, Psychological and Religious Evolution in Groups, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Conception of the experiment

Originally, it had been my intention to compare the learning of the students in a democratic class with the learning of students in a conventional class. Like Rogers, I believed that the fairest test of a democratic class would be to have a teacher who believed in this process, and that the fairest test of a traditional class would be to have a teacher who was skilled in this approach.¹ I decided to compare students in three groups taught by myself, with matched students in a conventional class which was taught by a very popular professor and which consisted of two lectures a week plus one seminar a week for every 25 students or so. I was primarily interested in comparing the "amount" of sociology learned--i.e. the content of a typical introductory course. In addition, general reasoning skills in sociology were to be compared.²

As the year progressed, however, I became increasingly aware of the inadequacies of the original conception of the experiment. I found that my concern with showing the value of democratic teaching was leading me to become worried when the classes discussed matters which I considered trivial; and worse, that I was attempting to sneak in material which I thought was important, and attempting to seduce the students into learning this.

After about two months of meeting with the students, I con-

cluded that what was more important than finding out how they compared with other students in terms of achievement on some objective tests, was discovering and analyzing what they, (and I) would do in a completely free situation, and how they felt about democratic teaching and its results. This would allow one to formulate questions and tentative answers about the learning process in such conditions, and possibly about the learning process in general. In short, rather than evaluating the classes according to criteria external to the students' phenomenal world, I proceeded to investigate the nature of this world.

Conceived in this way, the experiment is less in the tradition of the controlled experiments on the effects of student-centered teaching on academic achievement and social-emotional growth. It is more related to the early works of Lewin, Lippitt and White and to the latest studies of Mills, Mann, Moon and Duberman.³ In particular, the focus of this study is the same as that of Moon and Duberman in that it concentrates on the learning process. Mills and Mann are more concerned with group development and interpersonal relationships as phenomena in themselves. However, the research is more detailed and analytical than the personal accounts of Moon and Duberman.

Sources of the data

The data are of two types. There are my descriptions of the classes' proceedings, session by session, and there are the students' replies to the questionnaires issued to them four times through the year.

Until Christmas, my descriptions of the classes' proceedings

are based on notes I made after each session. After Christmas, the classes met in a small groups laboratory where the sessions were tape-recorded. Such a procedure was employed to enable closer analysis of the classes' proceedings. While I previously regretted that not all sessions from the beginning of the year had been taped, I found in writing this report that for the purpose of indicating the sequence of topics, and the reasons for the sequencing, that my own notes served as well as the tapes. In fact, while the tapes provided somewhat more accuracy in the details, the notes reflected more of the mood in the classes at the time--at least as I perceived it.

On each of the first three questionnaires the students were asked to tell how they felt about the sociology course they were taking (specifically what they liked about it and what they did not like,) and to tell what they thought they had learned in it. At the end of the fourth period, these questions were asked verbally as part of lengthy interviews which were taped. On all four questionnaires, the students were asked to report what they had read relating to sociology, their attendance in this and other courses, and their interest in taking further sociology courses.⁴ Additional miscellaneous questions were asked on all but the first questionnaire.

Organization of the data

The dates on which the questionnaires were returned (generally about one week after they were issued,) divide the year into four approximately equal periods: October and November, December and January, February and the first half of March, the second half of

March and April. These four periods are called Period 1, Period 2, Period 3 and Period 4, respectively.

My descriptions of the proceedings of the classes are presented session by session running through all four periods for each class.

The replies to the questionnaires have all been tabulated by period and by class. In the case of the open-ended questions on the class--"how do you feel about the course?" "what have you learned?" the following procedure was employed. I read through the questionnaires several times, finally grouping all comments of the same nature. For example, one student might say that he liked the course because there was "no pressure". Another might state that he liked the absence of deadlines, and a third that he appreciated the fact that he could concentrate more on other courses when necessary, because there was no required work in this course. These comments would all be grouped under a common heading of "no pressure." "No pressure" was then considered as a basic category employed by the students to describe what they experienced in the class. The category as such was formulated myself, but it was derived from the data.

These basic categories were combined into a higher level of comment type. At this level there are four types of comment: perceived merit, perceived defect, claims of personal benefit and analytical (non-evaluative) comment. These four categories are inherent in the responses to the open-ended questions, perhaps in part because the students were specifically asked to state what they liked about the course, what they disliked about it and what they felt they had learned in it.

The basic categories were also grouped in a second way, according to whether they were addressed to teaching approach, structure of the course, classroom interaction or substantive content. These four categories were employed to facilitate analysis of the data.

Analysis of the data

In each period the proceedings of each class are analyzed, and then compared with those of the other classes, according to the categories of teaching approach, structure of the course, classroom interaction and substantive content. These same categories are employed to analyze the responses to the open-ended questions. Again, the classes are analyzed separately, and then compared, in each period. Chapter IV deals with the proceedings, Chapter V with the students' evaluations as reported on the questionnaires. The concluding chapter brings together, and summarizes, the analyzes developed in these two chapters.

It should be noted that the purpose of this analytical work is to generate theory from the data.⁵ This involves explaining, on the basis of the information available, the reasons for differences between groups and for differences in a group over time. There is no attempt to verify hypothesis formulated a priori. Rather, the aim is to develop the questions and tentative answers from the data collected.

Composition of the experimental classes

The composition of the experimental classes was determined within the original conception of the experiment. However, this did not

strongly affect the research which was finally conducted.

For practical and theoretical reasons, it was decided to establish one class of 16 Arts students, one of 16 students in the Faculty of Education and one of 16 students from the other faculties. All students were to be in their first year of university and to have come directly from high school. In each class, half the students were to be girls. (Originally, it was thought that similar groups would be drawn from the conventional class and compared at least once with the students in the experimental classes.)

The classes were composed in this manner primarily to create internal homogeneity. It was assumed that this would help the students find common topics of interest, and that it would help prevent domination of some students by others who were either more intellectually inclined, more knowledgeable or older. Further, it was thought that the youngest students in university would put up less resistance to a new form of teaching.

Since only about 48 students could be placed in experimental classes, it was thought that by ensuring full representation of certain types of students, generalizations about this types could be more accurate than would be the case if the classes included many types of students.

The procedure for selecting the students was as follows. All students registering in introductory sociology were questioned about their faculty, year of university and the time of their last year in high school. If they had the appropriate time free on their timetables, first-year students who had attended high school the previous

year were asked in turn to enroll in the appropriate experimental class for their faculty. This process continued until the quota of men and women for that class was met. Before agreeing, many students asked what the classes involved. When told that they were to be small experimental classes in which the responsibility for the class was to lie with the students, there were no refusals.

Because of errors in the registration process, fifty students were enrolled in total: eight boys and seven girls from the Arts Faculty, nine boys and ten girls from the Education Faculty, and eight boys and eight girls from the other faculties. Specifically, in the case of the students enrolled in the experimental "mixed class", there were three boys from the Science Faculty, five boys and three girls from the Physical Education Faculty and five girls from the Household Economics Faculty. One boy and one girl soon dropped out of the Education class, (for reasons explained in chapter IV). All other students completed the year in their respective classes.

Meeting times of the experimental classes

All three classes met Tuesdays and Thursdays, from October to April. The allotted times were: 8:00 to 9:30 a.m. for the mixed class; 11:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. for the Education class; 3:30 to 5:00 p.m. for the Arts class.

Initial decisions on teaching approach

What must be said at the beginning is that I attempted throughout the experiment to fully play the role of democratic leader as theo-

retically outlined in Chapter I. However, what such a role meant in practice, was a source of constant concern. In Chapter IV, I discuss the decisions which I made through the year. Here I present the decisions which I made previous to the classes' first session.⁶

I was tempted many times before the classes began to think through some possible programs for the students to adopt if they so desired. My intention was to facilitate the decision-making process and to give the class the benefit of my ideas which were presumably more developed in the area of sociology than their own. So long as I gave the classes themselves the opportunity to make the final decision, (so I thought,) such preparatory work by myself would not be in violation of the principles of democratic leadership as usually defined. In fact, not to so prepare might be construed as leadership more laissez-faire in character than democratic. Since this was my first year of teaching my own course, it was particularly appealing to work up courses of study which excited me and which I was sure would be exciting and enlightening to the students as well.

More sober reflection convinced me, however, that should I present such a set of possible programs it would be highly unlikely that any other but one of these programs would be accepted, and that such a program no matter how logical or exciting to me would not necessarily be seen as such by the students. It became clearer to me that my job was not only to allow freedom and democracy to flourish, but to encourage this. If I were to neglect the fact that these students would all be unused to, if not totally unacquainted with the kind of freedom I was offering, I would be only nominally a democratic

leader. It seemed apparent that students in this society do not believe in their own ability to program their own learning, and that therefore they would only too quickly vote for a program designed by the teacher. A program established in this way would be a negation of genuine participatory democracy, and in any meaningful categorization could only be called authoritarian. It was, I concluded, essential to the practice of my role as a democratic leader, that I make very clear my intentions at the beginning of the year that not only the final decisions but the questions to be decided were completely in the hands of the students. Such a decision precluded my proposing a list of possible topics for discussion, or even a reading list. I further decided that a consistently democratic approach required that all decisions regarding problems in the class should be dealt with by the class as a whole. The chief external problem would be the requirement that the students receive a mark between 1 and 9 which was to represent the worth of their academic work. With regard to internal problems such as conflicts between individuals, lack of discussion, etc., I determined that again all decisions should be left in the hands of the class as a whole. I thought that learning could develop through the problem itself, that the class could learn to take responsibility for its own problems, and that this would be the only way of guaranteeing a solution satisfactory to more than myself. Further, I was not prepared to worry for the class and take sole responsibility for its problems when I had renounced the authority of the traditional teacher role.

Two other decisions were made, regarding my role, previous to

the first meetings of the classes. First I determined that I would attempt to act as with a group of peers. I would attempt no more detachment than I would maintain in a seminar of graduate students. Rightly or wrongly I believe that a detached stance is one form of authoritarianism and is inauthentic. I would "be myself"; i.e. I would make no special effort either to take a more active role than what the circumstances and my feelings suggested, nor a more detached role. I would not attempt to be either teacher or clinician, beyond sharing relevant knowledge when I felt I had this and presenting my interpretation of group dynamics when I felt the confidence and need to do so. I planned to express my ignorance and frustrations. In short, I wanted to interact naturally, taking on, (and discarding) roles because of my traits, skills, knowledge and needs and not because of my position assigned in and by the bureaucracy.

Secondly, I decided not to urge on the classes a procedure for decision-making. While I expected such to develop, and that I would state my own feelings on the matter, I felt that left to work ex nihilo we would develop a procedure that met our needs.

It will be recognized, however, that at another level certain decisions were made without consultation with the classes. The size of each class was set at 16, the number of each sex was predetermined, as was the internal homogeneity of the classes with regard to faculty, year of university and approximate age. I decided to start meeting in a seminar room, and to play the unconventional role of democratic leader as I understand it, (or rather, not to play any role of a bureaucratic kind.) I decided to make the course an experiment, which

fact alone, probably had consequences in terms of the group's activity.⁷

As was discussed earlier in this chapter, these decisions were made for experimental reasons and because of concern for the group's activity. The necessity of my making these decisions will be discussed in the final chapter.

FOOTNOTES

¹Carl Rogers, Client-Centered Therapy, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1951), p. 425.

²A comparison of students from the two types of classes was carried out at the end of the year, although not specifically in terms of content learned. See Appendix F of this thesis.

³See Chapter II of this thesis.

⁴See Appendix B of this thesis for a summary of their answers to these questions.

⁵Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss, The Discovery of Grounded Theory, (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967).

⁶As was noted in Chapter II, Carl Rogers has suggested that: "As further studies are carried on, the objective description of the classroom climate and of the instructor's behaviour seems a necessary starting point for any investigation." See Rogers, op. cit., p. 426.

⁷See Appendix E of this thesis for a discussion of this problem.

CHAPTER IV

PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL CLASSES

Introduction

In this chapter, the history of each class is described, session by session. For the purposes of this study, the academic year is divided into four approximately equal periods corresponding to the dates on which the questionnaires completed by the students generally were returned. Thus, Period 1 ends November 30 and includes 18 sessions; Period 2 ends January 30 and includes 11 sessions; Period 3 ends March 14 and includes 13 sessions; Period 4 ends April 18, the last day of classes, and includes 10 sessions. The division of the year into periods is primarily useful in analyzing the students' evaluations of the class, but the division does aid in analyzing the proceedings as well.

It will be noted that in Period 2, there are no classes on January 16 and January 18. This is because the week is set aside at the University of Alberta for the writing of examinations.

The data for the description of the proceedings in this chapter comes from two sources. Until Christmas, I made notes after every session. After Christmas, I taped most sessions in the small groups laboratory. There were advantages to each method of recording data. My own notes caught the mood of the classes and of myself at the time, whereas the tapes were primarily useful for recalling just how we pro-

ceeded from one topic to the next.

In describing these sessions I was concerned with indicating as parsimoniously as possible; 1) my role and feelings in the classes, (teaching approach); 2) the nature of the interaction, or atmosphere, of the classes, (classroom interaction); 3) the procedure by which topics were chosen, and activity was planned, (structure of course); 4) the nature of the substantive discussions, (substantive content). The latter two categories were employed in the description of virtually all sessions. The first and second categories were employed mostly in describing the initial sessions of each class. They are only employed in later sessions where there were important deviations from the patterns established.

Descriptions of Proceedings

The Arts Class

Period 1 :

October 3 : On this, the first day, seven girls and eight boys assembled in the seminar room. As in the other classes I started by introducing myself and briefly outlining my intentions in this course. I was initially asked to define sociology. As in the other classes, I turned the question back to the original inquirer, who suggested that sociology had something to do with groups. I suggested that we go round the room giving our names, saying why we took the course and what we thought sociology was about. This done, there followed a rather lengthy silence. Len then asked if the class would know enough about sociology after the year to get through senior courses. I said I

thought so because: a) it would be my role to tie the discussions into sociological knowledge; b) more important than "knowledge" as such is that introductory students get an idea of the perspective of sociology, and that this would come through during the year, partially with my help; c) the idea of conquering a first year course is not so important to future sociology learning as some people suggest. After a further silence, Len said "when I was downstairs waiting for this class to begin, I was looking at the anthropology displays and saw an Indian skeleton. I thought: 'someday, I'll be just like that'. Why go to school for one third of your life just so you'll die". Many of the class "jumped" on him, urging different reasons for living: "for others", "so you'll learn", etc. The discussion slowed down and died out. Several other discussions on the university, on war, etc. started up and each time died out. Several times I suggested that we may want to bear down on one topic. To my suggestions there was never any reaction. Instead, somebody would make a substantive remark. Finally, toward the end of the class, Len suggested that we should pick a topic for next week so that people could think about it. I questioned whether people wanted to and suggested that to me this group seemed rather reflective. Bob asked me if the way the class was going "alright". I reiterated that whatever the class decided to do was right. At this point one of the students stated that he came into Arts because he didn't know what he wanted to do. We went around the room asking people about their life goals. Only two had any definite occupations in mind. During the desultory substantive discussions I had occasion to discuss Durkheim and the nature of "scientific" sociology when one person asked how there could be sociological facts.

October 5 : Before the session formally began (with the sounding of the buzzer) some of us talked about psychology. The conversation ebbed and I remained quiet. There was silence for two or three minutes which was agonizing for a number of people. One girl said "this is ridiculous", another, keeping track of the time, said "one minute and forty-seven seconds". Finally Geraldine mentioned an anecdote led to the existential question "why should people live". The answers led to a brief discussion on India and the starvation there, then to a discussion on the role of religion in India. I asked why India still knows starvation while China does not. Some answers were given. I asked how we could study the reasons for this difference. The answers centered around the mass media and this led to a discussion on the validity of information from this source. I attempted to continue the discussion on research techniques but was unsuccessful. The University bookstore was mentioned and the conversation pursued this topic. Attempts by myself to return the discussion to India and China were fruitless. After a time, Len asked Roger why he was planning to be either a personnel officer or guidance counsellor. I suggested that we go round the room, re-introducing ourselves and stating "what we want to do in life". Most of the class had in mind the idea of majoring in psychology, planning to finally work in some form of counselling. One boy did not really want to be at University, and would have preferred to be playing in a band. The atmosphere was relaxed at this point and the group seemed in no hurry to leave when the buzzer sounded marking the end of the session. I had another appointment and suggested that we continue the introductions at the next session.

October 10 : We finished stating our career plans. One girl was interested in journalism, another in speech training, two girls were interested in social work, one boy was planning to enter law, four were planning on working with people after majoring in psychology, and the other six had no definite plans. Most of these six did not know why they had come to University. They asked me what I was planning to do. As I told them I had a feeling of acceptance as an equal. Len raised the issue of marks and the rest of the session was spent discussing this problem. I reiterated that the class would have to decide how this would be done. Some suggested that each person write periodic "reaction papers" to the class and that the marks be based on these. I suggested that this would be extending the totalitarianism of the university to include even feelings. In a couple of cases suggestions were made for marking procedures which would either help me with my thesis or keep me "out of trouble". Tangential to the discussion on marks was a discussion on the use of a textbook in the class. In answering their questions I distinguished manifest and latent functions. After a time, some people felt that the discussion on marks was "getting nowhere". Others disagreed, but I suggested we leave the topic for several weeks, (since no resolution was in sight) and this suggestion was accepted. Jack suggested as a format for the class that one topic be picked each session for the next session. He suggested one person be appointed each time to lead the discussion. The class suggested he take on this responsibility for next time and then asked him if he had any particular topic in mind for the next class. He suggested "Expo and Canada" to which there was a chorus of groans followed by laughter.

He said that he thought he better think of another topic. I mentioned that there were facilities for reproducing materials should anybody want to use them for a class discussion.

October 12 : Jack brought a list of proposed topics to class. The discussion began on one of these topics: fraternities. Jack said that because he found it hard to get out and meet people he was somewhat interested in fraternities. Another girl was also interested in them, but the rest of the class dismissed them as being exclusive. With some hostility, Geraldine said "let's get off them". Jack raised Quebec and separatism as a discussion topic. The discussion was concerned not only with Quebec versus Canada, but also Canada versus the United States. I suggested that perhaps it was easier to understand Quebec's feelings when we think about our own feelings toward the United States. As the class broke up there was some agreement, on my questioning, that this discussion continue next session. The participation was widespread with everybody present saying something. The discussion was interesting. After the class I began to think that I should take more initiative in looking up references, reproducing articles, etc.

October 17 : I felt uneasy during this session. The discussion on Quebec was boring to me, and so it seemed, to everybody else. There was again wide participation but the discussion was slow, almost laboured. Again I tried to interpret the French view. Searching for a way to have a better discussion, I suggested that we "sink our teeth into something", that we read some separatist literature, or do something of this nature. Nobody was interested. The discussion wandered until

I said that I thought that this discussion was boring to people and that I would like to know what topics would not be. I expressed a personal feeling that I would like to get into some subject in depth. A number of people refuted my claim that the discussion was boring them. After I asked Len, who was usually quite verbal, why he wasn't talking, and after he replied that for a change he thought he should listen, I concluded that I was worrying too much about the class, that I felt too much responsibility for the process. After the session, a couple of students approached me and said that they felt badly they could not decide on a topic of discussion. This heightened my feeling that I was expressing too much worry.

October 19 : Tom brought Walter Gordon's book on Canadian Nationalism to class, and he and I talked briefly about this before class. The session began with a rambling discussion on the University residence. Bob stopped this by asking sarcastically, "any more reports on the residence." There was quiet, then Geraldine said that she had been canvassing in a poor area of town for the United Community fund and that she had been dismayed to find them so poor, dirty, and apathetic. Somebody suggested that they were poor because they had so many children. I asked why they had so many children. (Surprisingly, there were few giggles.) During the consequent discussion, Len suggested that we should sterilize poor people who have too many children, which angered a lot of the others. Sarah in particular rebelled at the idea and then spoke out against contraception of any kind: "Only God can plan". The discussion continued on this point with some asking Sarah why He would allow so many people to be born that they had to remain

poor. She replied that God gives us free will. I wanted to step in and point out that seemed to me to be a blatant contradiction in thinking but felt that at this point there was not enough support and trust in the class for me to confront her while she was opening up with her ideas. While I thought about this, the conversation moved on. A couple of times, I tried to come back to the question of poor people and sex, but again to no avail. I once asked Tom why he had made a remark which so far as I could tell had no connection with any other remark by anybody else. His reply was: "no particular reason--just thought it was interesting." During the discussion, I had occasion to present Merton's paradigm of anomie types, and reiterated the distinction between manifest and latent functions. The class seemed interested and when the buzzer rang, I asked if we were going to pick somebody to introduce the next week's discussion as we had decided. Those that spoke said "no, it's much more interesting this way."

October 24: I had been assigned a "reader" to help me with examinations. Since there were no examinations we decided that she should spend some time in this Arts class to present material when she could, to help describe the class for the research, and to look up references. This session was the first she attended. After desultory starts at a discussion, June brought up the book The Harrad Experiment (about a fictional university residence which was sexually integrated.) Attempting to link the discussion to previous topics I asked where the experiment would fit on Merton's paradigm. Since it was clear that the class remembered little about the paradigm, I put it on the blackboard again. There was more discussion of The Harrad Experiment. I used as another

example of an action which would fit under the rebel category, the school Summerhill. Discussing the paradigm itself led to questions about conformity in this society. There was an evident problem in communication due to confusion in making normative statements in rebuttal to analytical statements, I tried to clarify this. I also presented Sumner's distinction between mores and folkways and Durkheim's original meaning of the term anomie. I felt under a strain in this class because of the reader's presence. This probably explains why I taught so much theoretical sociology and why I generally participated more. I sensed that others also felt a strain because of this newcomer who was not a full part of the group, and that therefore they were cautious about their statements.

October 26 : The session began quietly. Somebody reminded us that we were getting onto the topic of mores and folkways. I asked the class if they were interested in pursuing this. The response was lukewarm. I said that last time I had felt that I was dragging the class along on topics which I thought were important. I suggested that we talk about the class' process. Some thought that the class should go into matters deeper than it did. Others thought that the sharing of opinions was the important thing. It was noted that the class seemed to be "better" on the Thursdays, and that on all days the class was "better" during the last part of any given session. In both cases, it was because it took us a while to "warm up". I went around the room asking people to indicate what they thought we should do. Except for Len, Bob and Sarah, the class thought that there should be more depth to the course through reading. Lana said that our objectives should

determine how we proceed. I asked her what she thought our objectives were. She passed me a slip of paper on which she had listed four objectives of the class: 1) to deal with important problems; 2) to get new ideas; 3) to learn sociological principles; 4) to express opinions. We talked about these and agreed that we had been meeting all these objectives. Lana also had a list of topics which we had discussed. I read these out and asked the class which topics they had found most interesting. Conformity and poverty and children were the only two topics which had really been interesting. I suggested that perhaps in the latter case the reason was because the theme was sex. While some agreed that was the reason, others disagreed. Len thought that it was because they were talking about a problem. I suggested that we bear down on some topic which really interested us, and study it in depth. Len, Sarah and Bob reluctantly agreed. Bob saw the real problem being lack of participation on the part of some and said that studying some topic in depth wouldn't solve this problem. Len suggested that we start with the topic "poverty". Some suggested that we were only interested in this because of the question of sex which we had talked about in the same connection previously. However, all agreed on the topic when I asked everybody. The reader disagreed and suggested that we were really more interested in sex. Len started to talk about pre-marital sex and when I said "hold it, let's decide if that's what we want to do first," the only response was from Tom who said "we've already started talking about it." I checked, nevertheless to see if people agreed that sex would be the topic for a couple of weeks, and that this was to be followed by "poverty" as a topic.

Referring to a case study in the psychology text, Len said that some primitive tribes have no objections to premarital sex so why should it be immoral for him. During the ensuing discussion, Bob expressed concern that this was "becoming another psychology class". (He and three others did not take a psychology course). Tom said that some tribes are not aware that sexual intercourse is the cause of pregnancy. I discussed the example of the Trobrianders. After further discussion, I thought I should again point out that we have to distinguish between normative and analytical statements. Sarah asked, "well aren't they related?". I started to discuss the history of social science in answer to her question, but it was apparent after about five minutes that they were quite bored. I stopped talking for a few seconds and Sarah said: "can I ask a question? Is it right for people to sleep around?" She obviously had not been listening to my abstracted history of social science but instead had been thinking about this moral question which was presently bothering her. The class discussed this issue for the remainder of the session. When the buzzer sounded, signalling the end of the session, I suggested that we all read a book which was related to the subject. They agreed, and I suggested Margaret Mead's Coming of Age in Samoa. Len said that the book would not be relevant, as it was concerned with another culture. I replied that by studying another culture we have a new perspective on our own. A couple of others suggested The Harrad Experiment, but the rest felt that because it was fiction it would not be too useful. I urged Coming of Age in Samoa, and they agreed.

October 31 : Coming of Age in Samoa was not to be in the book-

store until the end of the week, although Jack found one copy in the downtown bookstore. Lana had brought to class a pamphlet on contraception, Len had brought Eric Fromm's The Art of Loving. I initiated the discussion and we started by trying to define the questions we were going to ask on the subject of sex. Playing a Socratic role, I tried asking why a society has sex mores. The answer given was: because of religion. I tried other questions, then finally stated a functional theory that society has to be maintained around the family as the core element for two reasons: the children, and to prevent hostilities through jealousy. The mention of jealousy caused Len to bring up a remark made by his psychology professor that we only do things because we're selfish. He and I got into a protracted debate on whether this doctrine of "ultimate hedonism" really tells us anything. Because I was not quite sure myself of what I was trying to say, I was quite vigorous in trying to explain my position that the doctrine is mere tautology. We wandered onto a discussion of logic and this led to my differentiating between deductive and inductive modes of thought. For some time after the session Len, Bob and I carried on the argument. (At the beginning of the class I had felt bothered by the amount of giggling within sub-groups. I did not make any issue of it but wondered after the class what I should do about these things: state my anxious feelings or deal with these feelings myself.)

November 2 : Shortly after the discussion began, Freud's name was mentioned. I gave the reference Civilization and Its Discontents as being the most sociologically relevant of his works, and introduced some of the basic elements of Freudian theory. Some students knew more

about some aspects of his theory than I did. They tended to dismiss Freud as being simply a product of the Victorian age, as being simply a neurotic. I pointed out that while understanding Freud in historical context was helpful, one also had to deal with his theory on its own terms and avoid the genetic fallacy. I talked about the "ego-psychologists", and suggested again that they read The Art of Loving. Somehow, we got onto the question of determinism and from there to the question of what is distinctive about man. I presented the basis of George Herbert Mead's theory. Huxley's Brave New World was raised and we talked about the possibility and meaning of this kind of society. I thought that the discussion was involving, and that it raised more important questions to us all. Thinking about the class later I became more aware of my own tendency to want to organize the class instead of relaxing and "feeling" our way to the questions which were of interest.

November 7 : Coming of Age in Samoa had not yet arrived in the bookstore. There was a lengthy period of silence at the beginning of the class. I broke it by asking, "what are we going to do?" Jean suggests a certain science fiction book for us to read. We replied that we would face the same problem as with the book we were waiting for. I said that The Art of Loving was available now. There was no reaction. I suggested that we all read it and this was agreed to. Some suggested that we get the book right then so that we would have something to do. There was no response. I suggested that we need some clearer ways of expressing our reactions to suggestions. When Sarah asked a question, I asked her to play chairman for the time, to check on agreements or disagreements. When Grant suggested we all go to the

bookstore right then, I urged him to direct his suggestion to the group. We agreed to his suggestion. After buying the book we sat in a room at the Students' Union Building and I talked about some of the basic points Fromm was making. I felt that this would be helpful because the education class, in their reading of the book, had missed so much material that I thought was important. About half the class stayed after the formal finishing time and we talked about Len's contention that if one is merely different, and writes books, he is called a great man.

November 9 : Attendance was down for this class, probably because of the upcoming mid-term examinations. All but one person had read some of Art of Loving. We discussed the book dealing with Fromm's distinctions on kinds of love, his "idealism" which many rejected, etc. A number of personal examples were used and we raised the existential questions. The session continued past the official finishing time.

November 14 : Coming of Age in Samoa was still not in the bookstore. The class started quietly. Roger asked a question about Fromm and we proceeded into a discussion on the basis of values, free-will versus determinism, and the nature of scientific evidence.

November 16 : A meeting which I was to address that evening had been widely publicized on campus. The topic was "The Future of the University", and I was asked to present it to the class. There was agreement with my analysis that the university was doomed as an institution because of the inherent conflict between the felt needs of the students and the goals of the Administration. There was a discussion on the programmatic implications of this analysis. We proceeded into a discussion of behaviourism and its assumptions.

November 21 : The students asked about my speech, and then continued discussing the university. Some of the students were depressed about their recent examinations in other courses. The session was mostly devoted to ventilating.

November 23 : After a lengthy silence at the beginning of the session, a half-hearted discussion started on the changing role of the family. Len muttered, "oh no, not one of those kinds of classes again." The book we were waiting for was still not here. Everybody, including myself, seemed tense. I asked if we wanted to continue the discussion of sex or if we would rather talk about poverty. After some silence people started talking about sex. I raised the question of why marriage as an institution existed. During the discussion, the reader provided information on various customs. As we talked, I found myself straightening out some confusions in my own mind. I suggested that we bring in one of the professors in the Department who taught a course on the family. Len immediately asked if he was married, indicating that unless he were, he would not be an authority in his eyes. Others indicated that they employed the same criterion for accepting authority.

November 28 : I announced that the professor I mentioned last time could see us some Tuesday afternoon. They said they would like to have him come. Roger suggested that we should visit a Hutterite colony and compare their family structure with our own. Serge and Sarah were anxious about going and "staring at people". On the basis of my knowledge and that of some others, we talked about the Hutterite way of life. Lana started asking people if they would be interested in making a visit to a colony. We finally decided to go, although without much

enthusiasm on the part of some people. I undertook to look into arrangements for a visit.

November 30 : The class began quietly until we began talking about which colony we were going to visit. Len asked why we had suddenly become interested in the Hutterites. I reminded him of Roger's suggestion, and then continued by saying that I would like to take his question further by talking about the whole process of the class. I mentioned that some of the questionnaires which I had just received indicated that for some people the class was quite frustrating because we hopped from topic to topic. I asked for opinions about this. In effect, two points of view were expressed: one group advocated spontaneity on the basis that "each person gets out of the class what he puts in", while the other group felt that we should take a book and work on it together. Len and Jean made a suggestion, (which I interpreted as a middle course,) that each person read on one topic. Before we made any decision, Len said that he always looked forward to the class but that after it he always felt depressed. We pursued this, and it appeared that the source of his depression was the fact that we never reached conclusions about the topics we discussed. It was meaningless. I suggested that all of us had these feelings but that not all of us articulated them to ourselves. Bob agreed saying that he would have said what Len had said the first day about the meaninglessness of it all if he had had the courage. June, on the other hand, said that these feelings did not bother her. It occurred to me that perhaps the difficulties the class was having in part stemmed from this existential anxiety which made the class seem like just another meaningless game.

Most of all, I concluded to myself and to the class, I was playing a game trying to make the class and my role what I had previously expected them to be. The advocates of spontaneity insofar as they thought we all should participate in the discussions and the advocates of the class reading one book, were both doing the same thing. They were suggesting ways for us to believe that we really were working, instead of allowing us to relax and talk about what really concerned us. As the session finished I suggested that I begin the next session by recapitulating what we had said this time. Overall, I was pleased that people listened to each other and directed their comments toward the point being considered.

Period 2 :

December 5 : I recapitulated, as requested, what transpired at the last session. Sarah who had not been present at the last class, asked what had happened to the idea of visiting the Hutterites. Serge said that he had been reading about the Hutterites and that he also was now quite interested in visiting them. I asked if people did not want to pursue the existential questions which last time we had been approaching. There was no response. (Perhaps, in part the direction of this session is explainable by the absence of Len.) Mystified, I tried to think as I talked what kinds of questions or activities would be interesting to this class for more than one session. I said that the mixed class had decided this morning that they were interested in going on field trips to a number of different places. This also seemed to be the direction that this class was thinking. The need seemed to be to

actually experience life rather than just talking about it; the students felt a need to get more in concrete touch with reality. They agreed with this analysis. I checked several times to see if they really felt in agreement, and it seemed to be so. We started talking about possibilities for field trips. I went to the blackboard and wrote down the suggestions that were made. "The Hutterites" was one suggestion. I had told them about the mixed class' plan to visit the jail, and they thought that they should do this too. Geraldine bemoaned the fact that we could not think of anything original, that this class was going to go on the same field trips as the mixed class, that it read the same book, Art of Loving, as the education class. She suggested we visit the provincial mental hospital. The Old Folks Home was suggested, but others asked why we should go there. I suggested that Goffman's analysis of the total institution might become clearer if we visited a number of institutions in this category. Visits to Boyle Street, the recognized Edmonton slum area, to a court and to a Buddhist Church were suggested. We narrowed down the list to the jail, the court, the mental hospital and the Hutterite colony. I asked for help in organizing these visits. Lana and I agreed to arrange the trip to the Hutterite colony. Alexandra took responsibility for the trip to the mental hospital, Bob for the trip to court, and myself for the trip to the jail. Lana knew the chaplain at the jail and said that she would try to have him come to the class. Grant said that he had seen the television show the night before which had dealt with the local jail, and that he would try to get a tape for the class.

December 7 : Grant reported that he had the tape. Tom asked

about the professor who was to come to talk to us on the family. I reported that he had been sick and that I had not invited him for a definite date because I did not yet know where we were going as a class. Again I was asked if he was married and again we discussed the necessity of having this kind of direct experience to talk about a subject. Some said that it would be more believable for the professor to talk about the family on the basis of his own experience for the same reason it is important for us to visit the jail. We talked on the question of objectivity for a time. I took the role of the positivist and for most of the class argued from that position (which I announced as not my real position.) The discussion reached the point where I was talking about Walden Two. At one point the reader asked with frustration what the theorists were achieving in terms of finding actual facts. Near the end of the class I presented criticisms of the positivist position. I reminded Alexandra, Bob and Lana about the projects they had undertaken to organize for the class.

December 12 : For the first 20 minutes we listened to the tape on the jail which Grant had brought. It was sensational and interesting. Many in the class were surprised that corporal punishment still existed in the jails. A discussion developed on how tough a jail should be.. I asked what people would do if they were Attorney General of Alberta and responsible for the penal system. June replied that she would study the practises in other countries and pick the best. There were no substantive answers, however. I talked about the concepts of deterrence and rehabilitation in penal theory. I tried to link these to the larger philosophies of behaviourism and existential psychology, but the

abstraction was obviously not interesting to most of them. Len groaned as I went to the blackboard to more clearly present my thoughts. I described a project of one of our professors who had worked on the philosophy of trying to free juvenile delinquents. I suggested that we hear him, and they agreed.

December 14 : The professor who had run the project on juvenile delinquency came and talked. There were many questions and interest was very high. Most of the time, the speaker talked about individual cases as examples. A number of students were indignant about the fate of these juvenile delinquents and about the fate of projects to help them. As the class finished, I asked the reader to post a list of readings on criminology on the board. The class was already well over the official finishing time, and for the most part these references were ignored.

December 19 : As previously arranged, the class was cancelled and we visited a court in session. It was a rape trial. Many of the class had returned to their rural homes so that there were only six of us there.

January 4 : We talked about the rape trial. None of us had stayed for the final judgements, but I said that what I had learned there was that the formal process of justice was totally irrelevant to the real problem faced by the people involved in the case (a man and his ex-wife and their children). At my request, the class agreed to meet in the small groups lab. Somehow the discussion wandered onto the subject of the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States. Serge and Sarah said that they did not believe that it existed. I presented

my evidence for its existence but this did not have much effect. I said that I would bring a copy of The Invisible Government to class for them to see for themselves.

January 9 : This was the first session in the small groups lab. The professor in charge of the laboratory joined us for the first half-hour to show us around and to explain the uses to which the laboratory is usually put. After he left, different members of class asked me what I planned to do with my thesis, how I was going to use these tapes, etc. My answers led to a discussion of the role of statistics in social science. We talked again about the use of books, and again people said that field experience is more "believable" than books. Lana mentioned that the book we had been waiting for had arrived. However on the advice of Geraldine and Jack who had read part of it, the class decided not to use it. The last part of the session was spent working out arrangements for the forthcoming visit to the local jail. The class agreed to meet on January 23 and 30, even though half the people would be at the jail each time.

January 11 : The session started casually with a number of people talking about a psychological experiment they had participated in. The focus of discussion moved from the psychology laboratory on campus to the medical laboratories where cadavers are held for medical students. There was a lot of giggling, and I asked why we do that when we talk about death. Stories of experience with death were exchanged until Grant changed the topic to the morality of breeding dogs for research purposes. This topic in turn moved to the ethics and significance of heart transplants which at this time were making world head-

lines. The meaning of the inevitable brain transplant was also discussed. Lana raised the issue of charity drives. I said that I thought all charities should be financed by the government. The merits of this idea were discussed. When Len said that he didn't see how "two boxcars of barley" was going to alleviate poverty, we discussed the question of world poverty. During this discussion I added information on the world trade situation and on the relationship between poverty and birth rate. Sarah asked how it could happen that Western civilization became so developed when other civilizations are older. I said that this was an important question and talked about it for a while. I referred them to Lewis Mumford's Technics and Civilization and discussed the theories of Marx, Weber and others. Jean asked if the cyclical theory of history meant that the United States was going to decline. This led to a discussion of current problems in the United States including the problems associated with the big city and the race problem. The latter topic led to a discussion of the Canadian Indian and the problems he faces. Cultural, linguistic and economic problems were identified and discussed.

January 23 : Half the class was there; the other half was visiting the jail. I announced a panel which promised to be of interest, then there was silence. Dan asked me whether I thought sociology was better than anthropology which he was interested in. This led to a protracted discussion on the respective merits of the two disciplines. The class was interested in my reasons for being in sociology. A number of questions were asked about university life in general. Questions were asked about the pedagogical and methodological assumptions of my

thesis and this led to an explication by myself of the different approaches sociologists take to their research.

January 25 : The students who had visited the jail Tuesday talked about their experiences and this led to a general discussion about the nature and purpose of such institutions. As I had done a month ago, I asked the students what they would if they were Attorney General. Responses were slow until Lana said that she would try to set up some kind of arrangement like the professor's project with juvenile delinquents which we had heard about in December. Again the relative merits of attempting to punish and rehabilitate prisoners were discussed.

January 30 : Half the class was here while the other half was at the jail. As was the case last Tuesday, for the first half of the session the students took the opportunity of the smaller group to ask about my goals in life and ideas about sociology. This time also they asked a lot of questions about general university life. The discussion turned toward crime and its reasons after talking about Roger's reasons for wanting to be a school counsellor. The discussion proceeded to considerations of the nature of lower class life, and from there to consideration of social class in general. I reiterated Merton's paradigm in order to clarify some aspects of the discussion. I became involved in an argument, which lasted well past the official finishing time for the session, about whether it was inevitable that there would always be a lower class and an upper class. I was challenged by this argument and had to think through some of my own questions and confusions.

Period 3 :

February 1 : Alexandra had been steadily trying since December to arrange a field trip for the class to the provincial mental hospital. She had finally been able to arrange a visit for five people on the next Tuesday. The first part of this session was devoted to arranging this trip. Lana had tried to get a chaplain from the jail to join us for this session but he was unable to do so at this time. We talked about the experience of the half of the class which had visited the jail last Tuesday. I asked them if there were any sociological questions which occurred to people as result of the visit to the jail. Some questions about rehabilitation were mentioned, but for the most part the discussion kept returning to concrete incidents at the jail and the meaning of these. The session continued with a discussion on whether one should be a pessimist or optimist in our society with Len and Sarah being the main protagonists for each of these positions respectfully. The session finished with a discussion on whether Indian culture should be allowed to exist and on how society should help Indians.

February 6 : The session started very slowly with brief discussions on a variety of matters but with no indication that we wanted to look into any subject in depth. Sarah suggested that we listen to some of the tapes. Dan asked me about social work. I said I would be glad to talk about the latter if that was what people wanted. Very slowly the class decided to defer listening to the tapes until the end of the class. After talking about social work and the academic requirements for being a social worker we began discussing the nature of learning in the university. I suggested that one reason why the class had trouble

deciding what to do, as for example during this session, was the effect of the formal education system on the child. We talked about the class. Geraldine suggested that if the class continued another year it would be different. I asked why people did not bring up topics for discussion which interested them and the answer was either that there are not many intellectual topics which occurred to them, or that personal matters were not properly talked about in a situation like this. They asked me how I came to think that teaching should be carried on in this way. There was a great deal of sharing of experiences about when, where and if people thought about intellectual matters. The session finished with a discussion on what I intended for this class and why I took the approach I did. Sarah in particular felt that I should provide more leadership, and that in a sense I was "using" the class.

February 8 : Lana had arranged for the chaplain from the jail to talk with the class this session. When he left, there were about thirty minutes remaining in the session. These were devoted to discussing the chaplain's remarks, and from these, the dynamics of social change. I mentioned that a friend of mine who worked in the city welfare department had spoken to the education class. They said they would like to hear him talk about welfare also.

February 13 : The session started with a number of people suggesting alternatives for the class. Grant had heard an outspoken philosophy professor talk about marxism at an extra-curricular meeting. He suggested we ask him to speak to us. While not all students were enthusiastic about this idea, they all agreed. Serge suggested that we talk with somebody responsible for the penal system in Alberta, and undertook to

arrange an interview. Jack had heard about the movie "Nobody Waved Goodbye" which had been shown in another class. He suggested that we see it and all agreed. The conversation wandered and then became more intense on the subjects of the jail and the mental hospital. We considered how these could be changed. At one point Sarah, who had been reluctant to be pessimistic about society's institutions, said in frustration, "well if we can see the problems caused by these institutions, why can't others?" We talked about our own apathy about conditions such as exist in the jail. Some suggested that we were too rich as a society and therefore did not worry about what happened to the less fortunate. I asked why in Latin American countries the upper class students in the universities were usually in the forefront of social change, but there was no clear answers. Various methods of arousing Canadians to this society's problems were discussed.

February 15 : The city welfare worker came to this session accompanied by a friend who was studying to be a social worker at the local institute of technology. They talked about the welfare program in the city and then about the social work program. Most of the questions were concerned with the details of social work.

February 20 : The discussion took off from last session's visitors' talks. There was some concern expressed by Roger that the visitors were not entirely sincere, that they did not seem to be really involved in the problems they were talking about. The discussion became more generalized to that of the welfare system in general. About two-thirds of the way through the period, Lana said that she had read the pamphlet, "Indians and the Law" which the chaplain had left

with us when he was here. She reported on some of the major findings of the study on which the pamphlet was based.

February 22 : The philosophy professor talked with the class about the marxist analysis of imperialism. About half the class seemed quite interested, the other half seemed quite bored.

February 27 : The class all went to the Provincial Legislative Buildings to talk with the superintendent in charge of correctional institutions. The meeting lasted two hours and much was learned about the government's plans and attitudes toward penal institutions

February 29 : The class began discussing the forthcoming election for Students' Council positions. The discussion shifted to analyzing last session's meeting with the superintendent of correctional institutions. The questions of who goes to jail and why, how does the bureaucracy operate and where should the pressure for change come from were discussed. We discussed the question of how much privilege should the rich have and this brought the discussion back to the current question on campus: how high should the tuition fees be? I introduced concepts of the guaranteed annual income and we explored the various consequences of the hypothetical introduction of such a policy.

March 5 : As previously arranged we watched the movie "Nobody Waved Goodbye". The movie was a portrayal of two adolescents who became alienated from their middle class parents with the boy becoming further and further locked in a pattern of crime, and the girl getting pregnant and leaving him.

March 7 : The first part of the session was spent discussing the movie which we had seen last time. It provided a good base for a

discussion of the questions adolescents must ask themselves. The question of the extent to which youth are prevented from growing up in their own way led into a discussion of the local celebrities who were leading the protest movement against raising the tuition fees. The focus of the discussion shifted from the image of these people to the issue of the fees itself. The session finished on the matter of tactics of social change.

March 12 : The session started soon after the students' march to the Provincial Legislature, protesting tuition fee raises, had finished. For the first half of the session, this was the topic as I tried to probe their feelings about themselves on what was for most of them their first protest march. The discussion lagged, different items were brought up, and the discussion finally settled on the topic of Vietnam. At one point I presented a ten minute "background talk" on the history of the war, about which most were professedly quite ignorant.

March 14 : I introduced the question of marks. There was concern expressed that the marks not get me or them into trouble. At first people suggested that they get only a "pass" and not an actual stanine mark. When I explained that this was not possible, some suggested I mark them. I said that I would rather not, and asked them how they would mark the class. They found it difficult to respond and suggested criteria, (such as attendance,) which were soon dismissed. Three other methods of marking were suggested: that each person assign his own mark, that all members of the class receive the same mark, and that the marks be randomly distributed between six and eight (out of

nine) with each person taking his chances as to which mark he himself received. The last idea was quickly dismissed by some, but others continued to urge it until finally a trial run was done with people drawing numbers from a hat amidst great hilarity. The class finally decided to have each person assign his own mark, explaining it to me.

Period 4 :

March 19 : The class began talking about possibilities for one more field trip. We thought back to the list of possibilities that we had drawn up on the blackboard in December. A number of people thought that we should go to the Hutterite colony, but no final decision was reached on this. Laine mentioned a speaker on campus who had been in the United States Army and was speaking out against the American presence in Vietnam. This led to a general discussion of Vietnam. When Jack expressed concern about the apathy in this society about issues like Vietnam, we got onto the effect of affluence on our political awareness and from there to a discussion of social class itself.

March 21 : About half the class did not attend this session, probably because of mid-term examinations in other courses. The discussion began with consideration of the possibility that new drugs could increase learning, a prospect which was shown on a recent television show. We discussed the implications of this eventuality and this led to talking about the responsibility of the scientist. We continued by talking about conservation problems, which in turn produced discussion on scientific progress, and from this a discussion of old age. We talked about the concept of the guaranteed annual income and

fanatasized about the likely implications of such a policy, particularly if young people were guaranteed a wage. We talked about the socialial-ization process. June asked "what is maturity". The question apparently resulted from her worrying about her lack of concern about her future. The session finished on this point. I told the class that I had seen a sign adwertising some kind of "happening" in the education faculty to be held next Tuesday. I said that I was going, that I thought they might find it interesting too, but that the room would be open if they wanted to meet without me.

March 26 : The education "happening" turned out to be a short movie early in the afternoon. When I arrived at the small groups lab there were only about six people there. We talked for a while, then decided it was too nice a day to spend inside a building. We went for a walk during which time several, particularly Dan, expressed their frustrations with the university.

March 28 : The first part of the session was spent with general conversation while each person wrote down the best time for his interview at the end of the term. After about half-an-hour Serge asked "what are we going to do the rest of the year". Some suggested that the class visit the local mission for homeless men. Since we agreed that it would not be a good idea for the whole class to go, Roger and Grant said that they would. Serge asked what had happened with the plans to go to the Hutterite colony. Most of the class decided to visit the colony, and I undertook to make arrangements. It was an hour before the class began discussing one topic in a group. This happened when one person mentioned that in Alberta schools, biological evolution

is still not taught. The session finished on the topic of religion. I presented the theories of Marx and Weber on the difference between Catholicism and Protestantism.

April 2 : The session began discussing the latest meeting of students to discuss further action to stop the tuition fee increase. This led to a general discussion of university and provincial finances and politics. We talked about the plight of the farmer in this province. Roger, a farm-boy, was the main protagonist and resource person. The last few minutes of the session were spent discussing tricks in writing examinations, the coming Liberal Leadership Convention and other connected matters.

April 4 : The students who lived in residence told me that the resident students were opposed to a planned demonstration against the Board of Governors of the University which regularly met there. This led to a general discussion of the residence, its regulations and the attitudes of the people who lived there. We began discussing fashions in clothes in residence, then in society as a whole. The session finished with a general discussion of social change.

April 9 : We arranged to visit the Hutterite colony the next Tuesday. The weather was fine, and we decided to meet outside. The racial situation in the United States was discussed, with particular reference to the role of the recently assassinated Martin Luther King in the civil rights movement. I gave some references to autobiographies of American Negroes.

April 11 : I attempted to have the graduate student expert on Hutterites visit with us, but he was unable to come. We made final

arrangements for transportation to the Hutterites colony. We talked about the final examination and the year-end interview. The last meeting on tuition fees was discussed. We talked about what we should look for at the Hutterite colony, and I gave them some information on the basis of my limited experience

April 16 : About two-thirds of the class spent the afternoon at the Hutterite colony.

April 18 : This last session was held without my being present, as was previously arranged. Lana nominated Len for chairman, and since this suggestion was not opposed, Len played this role. Mainly he read the questions and kept the discussion moving from question to question. In general, the students seemed to feel that the class had been democratic in the sense I had intended. A major debate was conducted over the question of whether I should have organized more activity at the beginning of the year.

The Education Class

Period 1 :

October 3 : On the first day, 19 students (10 girls and 9 boys) all in their first year of the Education Faculty assembled in the seminar room. For one girl this was the last session. She apparently transferred into another section of Sociology 202 on hearing how I planned to conduct myself as a teacher. She felt that she would not learn enough sociology this way. The only other person to transfer out of any of the experimental classes was a very quiet boy who stopped com-

ing to this class within a month, before the first questionnaire was handed out, because he found it extremely difficult to talk to the class. He later dropped out of the University completely.

The first session began with my introducing myself and asserting briefly my philosophy of teaching. What was to be the pattern of class interaction in subsequent meetings immediately manifested itself during the session. The first person to speak was Miles who asked me to define sociology. When I asked him what he thought, his reply to the effect that sociology had to do with groups, was amended by Fred to include that of the relationships between groups. Miles, who would usually vocalize the most conservative and cautious sentiments in the class, and Fred who had "lived with the hippies", who in some measure visually appeared such, and who spoke for the hippy love ethic, were to dominate future meetings with their aggressive arguments. Such an argument soon developed in this first session.

Miles suggested that we start off discussing the race-Negro question. Another girl suggested "hippies" as a timely subject, and the class assented to both ideas, although with greater interest being evidenced for hippies. When another girl suggested half jokingly that the class "bring a live one in" to talk with, Fred said that he had lived with such people. The discussion wandered until Miles and others suggested that we introduce ourselves. I asked people to add to their introduction what they thought about sociology. (Several it turned out had taken sociology in high school.) Further suggestions for topics of discussion were offered as the introductions finished, and a brief discussion of marking procedures was quickly left unconcluded.

With more than half-an-hour to go in the meeting, the discussion turned to hippies, primarily because of Miles' pre-emptive question to Fred, "what's a hippy?" Fred proved to be rather an articulate and agreeable spokesman for the hippies and the discussion became very excited. As the meeting closed on the question of human nature, several students booed the buzzer which sounded change of classes.

October 5 : I did not begin the conversation. I remained silent until one student asked me about the marking system again. For a good part of this meeting, marks were the subject of concern. Some favored evaluation on the basis of participation in class, some suggested that all students should receive the same mark. The question again proved difficult and the class was happy to see the discussion drift into larger question of the philosophy behind the grading system and from there into the philosophy behind the education system. Ready agreement was expressed with my expression of disillusionment with the idea of marking through standardized tests. In answer to the inevitable remark that students will not study if they are not motivated by examinations, I recommended A. S. Neill's Summerhill for an alternative view. As education students a fair amount of interest was expressed in the book, and the discussion moved on to movies such as "To Sir with Love". We were brought from another direction to the question of human nature as some asked, "are people naturally lazy?"

October 10 : At least three students indicated that they had bought Summerhill and that they liked it. Miles had talked to his mother, a teacher, about the book and presented her critique of the school as being unrepresentative of schools because it is an idylli-

cally located boarding school and therefore not a reasonable experiment. This led to a discussion of public schools which have employed experimental teaching systems. As this discussion died for lack of concrete examples or references, the question of human nature was brought up again and the discussion became essentially a dialogue between Fred and Miles. After about half-an-hour I stopped the discussion and asked what others thought about the question. Several times I had to stop an excited Fred from continuing. This was done without hostility on either side, so far as I could tell. Several of the moderately vigorous participants asked specific quiet students what they thought. This included Ralph, a long time friend of Miles, asking the boy who was soon to quit the class and who was clearly uncomfortable being put on the spot. I found myself coming to his rescue by directing the question back to Ralph.

October 12 : Before the session, Miles and Ralph approached me in the hall and said that they were not going to say anything in this class at all. They were tired of having just a few of them carry the burden of the discussion and were going to force others to get involved in the discussion. I said that of course they should do what they want but that I thought it would be valuable for them to participate if they had something to say. Fred entered the class with a transistor radio broadcasting the World Series. I gathered that he was in cahoots with Miles and Ralph. I felt extremely uncomfortable because I did not want to in any way build an authoritarian role for myself, yet I personally felt uncomfortable with the background noise of the radio. Somehow I communicated my personal conflict about having to listen to this when

I came to talk with other people. He tuned it down but not off, and kept it to his ear. With Miles, Fred and Ralph determined not to talk in the session and with my being determined not to initiate the discussion, the class began very slowly. There was a very long silence accompanied by the usual embarrassment and fidgeting, evidently much to the delight of Miles and Ralph. One remark was thrown out by one of the moderately active participants but was not picked up. Sam mentioned that he had seen the movie "Warrendale" which allowed questions to be asked of him. Enough interest was sparked about this documentary of a school for emotionally disturbed children in Ontario to result in suggestions that all members of the class see it so that all could discuss it. By this time the conspiracy had expired and Ralph, angry about the class's inability to make a discussion, methodically went around the room asking people if they intended to see the movie. With all but one of the shyest girls saying "yes", the question was raised about the desirability of exerting group pressure on individuals. Fred suggested that instead of pressuring people to attend, that we simply see if enough people had attended the movie, at the next class, to warrant discussing it and that such a discussion might inspire others to see it too. That matter settled, Fred asked me "do you have to read in university?" I explained the skimming method that I and others used. This led Miles, (an immigrant from Britain as a child), to ask the class as a whole if Canadians read much. What I considered to be rather a silly discussion developed on whether the futuristic television show "Startrek" was "realistic" or not. My contention that it was simply a matter of defining ones terms, however, did not seem to satisfy anyone

else. As the class left the room, Miles and Fred were muttering about the general lack of "participation".

October 17 : When I came into the next meeting of the class a lively discussion on Warrendale was already in process. The discussion stopped as some asked me about my picture in the campus paper. I answered their questions but quickly turned the discussion back to Warrendale. A few questions were raised about some of the Freudian touches in the school, which led to an impromptu 15 minute lecture by myself on Freud. There was some silence after I finished talking which I attributed at the time to their thinking about the highly-charged issues of masturbation, etc. There were a couple of questions about Freud and a couple of derogatory remarks about his over-concern with sex which led to a little more talk by me on the neo-Freudians. The discussion returned to the use of the baby bottle for older children at both Warrendale and Summerhill. This discussion died and a discussion on spanking began which apparently had been part of the topic before class. This led to a discussion of strapping in the schools and some poignant testimonies about personal experience with teacher brutality. Twice during these discussions I helped some of the quieter students to express a point by breaking into the bedlam to draw attention to their points.

October 19 : While I was in sitting in the seminar room waiting for the next class, a professor who had been with me at a meeting of youth agency workers the previous day talked to me about this through the door. Overhearing the conversation as they came through the door, several students asked me what it was all about. Pleased, I presented

what I thought was a provocative account of what I thought about the role of youth agency workers in this society. The response was minimal. After a couple of minutes Miles said "about spanking . . ." and the discussion on that topic resumed. Gord, who had become very enthusiastic about Summerhill, read a brief passage from that in which Neill explains why in certain cases he has actually rewarded children for stealing. I broadened the discussion about learning-by-punishment versus learning-through-love with a presentation on behaviorism versus the humanistic, existentialist, neo-Freudian, Maslowian approach to psychology. There seemed to be a great deal of interest in this. For some reason, probably in response to a statement about the atheistic existentialists, Miles said "we're on earth to get to heaven" and a long heated discussion ensued. One of the quiet girls, Barbara, who indicated at one point along with a couple of others, that she was an atheist was sitting beside me. I talked to her briefly during the pandemonium and then urged the class to be quiet so she could explain her view point. She was interrupted but several in the class intervened to bring the discussion back to her. As another atheist I was also the object of much interest and became fully involved in the discussion. Morale was high. For all the excitement there was an air of friendliness in the arguments.

October 24 : The class began with Miles resuming the discussion on religion. Brad who had been absent from the last class immediately entered into the discussion. A particularly vigorous argument developed between him and Miles. Fred presented his shocking but tantalizing theory that there are three gods, and concluded the class with a solemn

affirmation of his having learned something from the discussion: there are not three gods but four. (His views had enough impact to cause one girl to refer to this during the interview at the end of the year.)

During the discussion I referred to some of the existentialists, mentioned Weber's studies as an example of how religion could be studied sociologically and suggested that we might read Malinowski's Magic, Science and Religion as an example of this kind of approach. With the response haphazard, Ralph played his role of asking people around the room what they thought of the idea. Since only four of us were interested, (the declared atheists,) the idea was rejected. During the class, I became conscious of my desire to encourage people to develop some objectivity about themselves and thus began prodding people with questions about how they came to be Roman Catholic or whatever. Few, it appeared, seriously considered the historical or sociological reasons for their beliefs.

October 26 : At the beginning of the next class, I informed them of an announcement that had just been made to me, to the effect that the Department of Sociology had some credit with the motor pool of the University which could be used for field trips. As in the other classes this resulted in an air of hilarity and excitement. Miles took a lot of leadership in the discussion, suggesting visits to rural schools, poverty areas, jails, etc. One of the quietest girls, Jane, mentioned that there was a Hutterite colony near her home town. Interest was indicated, and I said I would speak to one of the sociologists in the Department who was somewhat of an expert in such matters to speak to the class. This discussion concluded, Miles left the

class for an appointment. Fred urged the class to continue discussing religion. The atmosphere seemed uneasy to me, perhaps because with Miles gone, the class would have to develop a new mode of interaction, particularly because there could be no banter between Fred and Miles. Fred began by developing his theory of the four gods and I attempted to get other people to explain what new insights had occurred to them since the last meeting. One girl, Laura, said that the discussions had confirmed her agnosticism. At the end of the meeting I tested out my feeling that to most of the class the discussions were not very fruitful. Only two fairly quiet participants said they found that the discussions "didn't get anywhere". To the rest, hearing others' viewpoints was apparently worthwhile in itself.

October 31 : The next class started desultorily with some conversation about my activities in campus politics, and for some reason about the Central Intelligence Agency on which I gave a reference. I asked the class if we wanted to carry on the discussion about religion. Hesitatingly, a few said "no". I asked about alternatives and it turned out that Laura had been reading about prostitution. She said that she would like to discuss that in class. Playing the role of chairman, I checked to see if everybody agreed and it turned out that all did with the exception of Sam who, it was established, was not embarrassed to discuss it but was simply not interested in the topic. Having no alternative, however, he readily agreed to discuss it. Laura began by quoting some passage by Reiss on extra-marital sex. The discussion moved to the question of why a person becomes a prostitute, and then to the distinction between a call-girl and a prostitute. Some of the boys who

had worked as bell-hops enlightened the class with stories from the hotel trade. Some suggested that moving from prostitute to call-girl was a way of getting ahead for some girls, which led to a brief presentation by myself on social class and social mobility and the inevitable Merton's anomie paradigm. As the buzzer rang, I suggested people look up references on prostitution for next time.

November 2 : I asked if anybody in the class had found materials on prostitution. Laura and another girl who was fairly active in class discussions, Eleanore, had brought materials from which excerpts were read. Eleanore's passage presented a psychological approach to the matter (emotional problems), Laura's a sociological approach (the need for money). I pointed this distinction out, suggesting that the two reasons for a girl becoming a prostitute were sufficient but not necessary. The too-ready agreement to this point made me feel that the abstraction was unimportant to them. Conscious of my own inadequacies, I suggested we talk about the sociological conditions for prostitution rather than the psychology of the prostitute. We identified "supply" and "demand" problems. Regarding the latter some suggested that the reason for prostitution was that men needed outlets for their sexual urges. Some asked Fred if he thought that the hippy ideal of free love would negate the cause of prostitution, and this led into a long discussion on free love, fidelity, and the concept of love itself. I suggested that it might be useful at this point if we read Erich Fromm's Art of Loving. Laura who had just read the book informed the class that it was "on reserve" in the Education Faculty Library. When I suggested we try to read the book by the next class, there was general

agreement but not enthusiasm. Ralph, frustrated as usual by the lack of decisiveness in the class asked, "well are we going to read it or not?" Practically all of us put up our hands.

November 7 : About one-half of the students had read a significant portion of the book. All but five people said they had looked at the book. There was silence until frustration drove me to say "okay, I'll ask it--what do people think about Fromm's book?" The replies disappointed me and added to my growing realization that students at this state of their education find it difficult to deal in abstractions. One girl, Carol, suggested that book was "okay, but I didn't think that the last part said very much". Sam and Laura, both avid readers with strong intellectual interest said something to the effect that it was a very good book and that it "said it very well". That seeming to exhaust the comments, I asked if anybody disagreed with anything Fromm said. A couple suggested that he was "too idealistic". I asked them if they all agreed with Fromm when he said that the abolishment of capitalism was necessary for a society based on love to grow. The only response was a few murmurs. I asked them why he said this. Sam and Laura both said briefly that it had something to do with conformity. At this point I felt too uneasy to continue the Socratic role and forthrightly explained how I understood Fromm to connect the two through the concept of alienation, and traced the concept to Marx. Again there was not much reaction until somebody said that they still thought he was too idealistic. This remark allowed people to speak on surer ground again and a vigorous argument ensued among about 10 people: Fromm being backed through different interpretations by Sam, Gord, Laura and Fred.

After a while I asked the class to be quiet for a minute "to give those who haven't had a chance to say something if they like." Ralph asked people directly to give an opinion and two of the quietest girls did. Soon however the vigorous discussions took over again. As the buzzer sounded, several people were telling both Fred and Miles straightforwardly but without hostility, to "shut up". I was very involved in this discussion. In effect we were talking about social change and I wanted very much to tell them my own feelings, to present different sociologists' views on the subject. I was also very interested in their concept of "the dedicated teacher" and would have liked them to expound on this. However, I did not feel there was an appropriate time to either talk or make this enquiry, and managed to keep quiet.

November 9 : Attendance was low this class, presumably because it was a mid-term test week in the University. People began by talking about things the class might do and talk about. Miles suggested that we go down to the Boyle Street area of the city, (Edmonton's most famous "blighted" area) "to check out some of the findings of the city's report on the area." Generally (including myself) people felt that this would be a difficult thing to do, and even when he suggested limiting the study to certain aspects of the report there was not much enthusiasm. He suggested we study the University and again there was little positive response. Anxious to talk about the things I did not have a chance to on Tuesday, I said that I would like to carry on that discussion. There was agreement to this, but foolishly I asked if anybody else had anything to say on last week's discussion first. We never did get to my concerns. Alice said that while she agreed with Gord, (who last meeting

had stated that he planned to go to Africa as some sort of teaching missionary,) that one should be idealistic, she did not feel one should go to other societies while we still had problems in Canada. She planned to work up north with native peoples. This led into a discussion on whether it is possible "to help them". Miles and Ralph stated that Indians do not want advice. "You can't do anything with them". I replied with a description of the aims of community development officers and community organizers. Carol talked about her aunt who lived in the north and who found it worthwhile inviting native people to her house to "get them interested in cleanliness". Eleanor had a friend who had worked in the Alberta Service Corps, the Provincial volunteer agency. Laura had Indian relatives whom she did not find lazy. I talked some about the position of the Indians in our society, and referred back to Merton's paradigm and the retreatist category as perhaps partially explaining behaviour which the white society finds so disgusting. For the first time, the class did not finish in a heated argument, but finished quietly.

November 14 : The class started slowly and the conversation somehow turned to teaching machines and I presented my views on their defects. This led somebody to bring up the Montessori school. I suggested that we read on the Montessori method and that I would look into the possibility of visiting the local school. I finally got to my question about what they had meant by the phrase "dedicated teacher" used two meetings ago. This turned out to mean simply doing the best job one can as a teacher. In the process Laura stated that she did not really want to be a teacher and that she was really only "in Education"

for the sake of her parents. Most of the rest of the class jumped on this remark saying that she could not possibly be a good teacher under these conditions. She denied this, but then explained her not wanting to be a teacher by saying that the schools "only indoctrinate personality anyway". This led me to talk about Riesman's analysis of the schools in The Lonely Crowd and so about Riesman's characterological typology. Interestingly, all who spoke with the exception of Miles, indicated that they would like the schools to be freer.

November 16 : There was a great deal of publicity on campus about an address I was to give that evening on the topic of "The Future of the University". A number of people asked me what I was planning to say. I checked to see if the class as a whole was interested and then outlined the theme of the talk. Since this was to the effect that university students are becoming less and less inclined to accept the present system which is becoming more and more bureacratic and thus rebellion is inevitable, the conversation turned to an analysis of revolution and rebellion. I was gratified to find that with the exception of Miles, there seemed to be agreement with this analysis and what I considered to be a sophisticated understanding of revolt and revolution. They did not demand of revolutionaries an articulated program but recognized that frustration itself could lead to legitimate revolution.

November 21 : Miles began the class saying that he and Ralph had been talking about the class and had thought that we should establish a procedure whereby each meeting a person talk and lead a discussion on some topic of interest to them. We discussed this idea and after checking, found it to be agreeable to all. The decision was

never seriously implemented however, (as was the fate of a similar suggestion in the Arts class.) We moved to a discussion of experimental schools when I mentioned that I had arranged for us to visit at the local Montessori school. Miles mentioned other schools in the Separate School system which also were trying to innovate in their approach to education and it was decided that we should attempt to visit all three schools. Miles undertook to look into the possibility of our visiting these schools. During the course of the discussion, I mentioned for some reason that the Mixed class had enjoyed their trip to the Hutterite colony. They were angry that their trip had not developed and felt that I was mostly to blame. I had thought that we were waiting for information from Jane about the colony near her home, but said that I would look into visiting the other colony.

November 23 : Having found that it might not be a good idea to go back to the Hutterite colony where the mixed class had visited, I asked Jane to check on the possibility of visiting the colony near her farm. The remainder of the session was spent arranging the visits to the three schools in three groups, two going Thursdays, the third on Tuesdays. It was agreed that I should set up the appointments while others would arrange transportation.

November 28 : I spent most of this class outside the seminar room making last minute changes in the visiting schedules. The only notable substantive discussion was an on-going argument between Miles and Fred about the respective merits of different local music groups.

November 30 : There was no class this day because two groups of us were visiting the schools.

Period 2 :

December 5 : The group that was to leave that afternoon for one of the schools had to cancel their plans because of a convention touring the school. Some time was spent working out alternative plans. That finished, Miles started asking rather aggressively about the two schools which had been visited the previous Thursday. I suggested that we discuss one school at a time. We did so and it turned out that both groups had been impressed with our respective schools. Gord had taken copious notes during the visit of his group and he reported from these. I found myself talking quite a bit about the school our group had visited, largely because those of the visiting group I was in, who were at this class, were reluctant to talk about the school. While the presentations from the other group were not sociologically sophisticated there was among many of that group a keen sense of what they regarded as the phoniness of much of the operation which they had visited. A discussion of the schools brought up the concern that the pupils from these schools might have difficulty, coming from experimental schools, in the Province-wide examinations which terminate junior high school and high school careers. This led to an analysis of the problems of innovation in a standardized bureaucracy.. I gave references to, and talked briefly about the works of Jerome Bruner, John Holt, Paul Goodman and Edgar Z. Friedenberg, as writings which would be interesting in conjunction with these visits of experimental schools. I also mentioned Saturday Review as being probably better for their purposes than the professional journals. As the class was leaving, Ralph sarcastically referred to Gord's "A. S. Neillism." We had also indicated during the class that he

was tired of Miles' aggressiveness.

December 7 : There was no class this day because two groups of us were visiting the schools.

December 12 : The Tuesday afternoon group which included Miles, Ralph and Fred assembled in the class and left forthwith for their school. Actually the group, through a combination of luck and enterprise, somehow visited three schools and attempted to get to a fourth. The absence of this group, presented us with a novel atmosphere. Of the usually talkative people, only Gord and Carol were there. I anticipated that the quieter ones would now find it possible to talk, but such was not the case. Since those of us who were left had visited the Montessori school either last Thursday morning or last Thursday afternoon, I brought up the point which Laura (who was in the same group as myself but who was not in this class) had made after the visit, to the effect that the teachers there were all women. We discussed the status of women in our society and the role expectations connected with that status. About half the girls present indicated that they felt discriminated against as women. I reminded them of the groans which came from the males in the class when the possibility was raised that some of the girls might have to drive their cars to the schools. When the topic returned to the Montessori method, I asked if any people had read any of the books which the people at the school recommended. No one had read much. We talked about the social class of students at the Montessori school and the "pros" and "cons" of religious exercises in the schools. The class finished quietly before the buzzer sounded as people seemed to run out of things to say.

December 14 : There was no class this day because two groups of us were visiting the schools.

December 19 : The class had decided not to meet this last day of term as the Tuesday afternoon group would be absent in any event and because other students would be out of town, at home.

January 4 : The class began with a lot of informal discussions among people about their experiences during the Christmas holidays. I explained to the class that for the benefit of this study I would like to meet in the small groups laboratory if they agreed. They readily agreed. After a while Fred suggested that the class listen to the latest record by the Beatles "Magical Mystery Tour" which he felt contained "a social message." There was a great deal of interest in this claim plus a great deal of disagreement, particularly from Miles who challenged Fred to interpret one of the songs on the album, "I am a Walrus". Amazingly, Fred proceeded to recite and interpret the lyrics of the song, line by line. The whole class was fascinated and listened intently as he talked for some twenty minutes. The buzzer rang before the question of listening to the record as a class was seriously considered. After class Fred asked me if he should bring the record to the next session. I suggested we wait until then to determine the class's feeling.

January 9 : This being the first day in the small groups laboratory, the professor in charge of the equipment explained to the class the functionings and purposes of the lab, the fundamentals of Robert Bales' "Interaction Process Analysis" and the theory behind some of the experiments which have been conducted. As was the case with the other

classes, there was a great deal of interest and excitement about all this. There were a large number of questions directed to the professor and Fred asked some critical questions. After the tour there developed a discussion on heart transplants. Near the end of class I presented Fred's suggestion that we listen to the Beatles record. Miles and Barbara could not "see the point" but some felt that the discussions would be worthwhile because they would involve 'the Beatles' interpretations of society", and from there our own views about society could be expressed. I asked if there were any other suggestions for using our time, and although Betty and others said they'd like to go on a field trip there was no serious discussion of this. I suggested that we try listening once. This was accepted. After class Laura, Alice and Gord asked to be able to observe one of the other classes. I discouraged this because as in the case of other requests of this kind, I did not think the class would be relaxed knowing there were observers.

January 11 : Fred brought "Magical Mystery Tour" and soon after the class began started to play it. A number of us got off our chairs and lounged on the thick rug of the small groups lab. There was a great deal of background chatter during the first few songs, and a couple of times I asked how we were going to listen to it. The chatter kept up for a while then settled down. The record jacket with the words was being passed around the room. Somehow as the record was started again to begin serious listening, and Fred lifted the needle off after the first song, Miles had the cover in his hand. Carol asked somebody to read off the words which Miles did. After each song Miles read the words and the class discussed the meaning of the songs. As

usual Miles and Fred continuously disagreed, with the latter presenting esoteric interpretations of the lyrics and the former attempting to mystify them. However, others were easily able to participate because the tone of the discussion was relaxed and unusually quiet. There were even occasional short meditative silences and many honest questions were asked of each other about possible interpretations. The discussions were fanciful, in my opinion, often profound, but with close attention being paid to each word of the songs. While the discussion perhaps did not enlighten us much about society, it did enlighten us about the social message carried in much of modern popular music. There was a general agreement that the songs were a commentary on society and its phoniness, including, according to Fred, the hippy segment of society. The class finished with the playing of another record Fred had brought.

January 23 : I mentioned that at the next class I would hand out copies of a speech by one of the professors in the department who had discussed present-day youth values, using the lyrics of modern folk-rock music as part of the material for analysis. Joan had checked with the Hutterite colony near her home town, and they had agreed to have us visit them. (We decided to have the field trip February 10.) As usual I played the role of a fairly strong chairman in this decision-making process. The decision made, Barbara asked "what can you do with a B.A. in sociology", and we talked about the various career possibilities. This led to a series of questions about my education and life-goals. I reported that, on the basis of the four or five questionnaires I had received back so far of the second batch, there seemed to be a feeling among at least a few people that there should be more content to the

course. I asked them if this was a general feeling. Miles said that it was kind of fuzzy and that not much sociology was being learned because there was not even "the bare bones of organization". He said he was particularly concerned about the lack of terminology which would be necessary in future sociology courses. Particularly Ralph, Fred, Carol, Sam and Laura jumped on him and said that he should suggest something if he wasn't happy. "It's up to us" they said. Carol reminded the class of the decision made in November to have one person lead a discussion on a topic each session. The decision had been forgotten with the field trips to the schools. Asking the quieter ones what they thought, we found that Linda and Derek agreed with Miles. Eleanor suggested that the problem was that we were accustomed to the traditional system. I kept the discussion open and prevented attempts to close it off just because Miles had "no alternatives" to the present system, and attempts to introduce a substantive topic. I outlined various alternative ways in which more orthodox sociology might be learned by those who were concerned about these. The most popular idea for a while, that of me giving lectures once a week with the other session in the week being devoted to discussions as at present, was in the end rejected by Miles, Linda and Derek in favor of the present system, much to the frustration of some of the others. The idea of returning to the earlier plan of one person introducing a topic each week, was modified to that of people suggesting topics when the idea occurred to them, which was virtually what had been the system since the beginning of the year. During the discussions Laura asked about the possibility of the course continuing next year. My first reaction was "no

chance, but as I thought about it, it seemed like a very good idea. One of the substantive questions raised during the course of the discussion was Barbara's "what is determinism?" (It was not related to anything which we had been discussing.) The procedural issue settled, we talked about this during the remaining time. Most of the discussion was comprised of my answering the question by outlining various deterministic philosophies. At the end of the period we agreed to discuss the Company of Young Canadians, another unconnected substantive question which Sam had raised during the procedural discussion.

January 25 : I handed out the transcription of the speech, which I had promised last session. Fred spent the first part of the meeting reading it. Miles, Laura, Carol and Eleanor had brought recent newspaper clippings about the Company of Young Canadians. Miles began by expressing his frustration at not being able to figure out what the C Y C was trying to do. Others read from their clippings but still the goals were not clear. Several indicated however that they felt it was an honest attempt to help people. On the basis of my acquaintance with a number of people in the C Y C, I explained its goals as I understood them. Gord said that this just seemed like a sneakier way to do what the Indian Affairs agent and welfare worker were doing. This led to a fairly lengthy presentation by myself on different kinds of programs for juvenile delinquents, in particular talking about a project one of the faculty of the Sociology Department had been engaged in where the youths were encouraged to help themselves. I referred back to Erich Fromm's distinction between loving a person in a way to keep him tied to you and loving him in a way to help him become independent. A

practical question of how poor people could financially help themselves arose, I presented my answer that this was the role of political pressure. Miles suggested that pressuring the government to supply funds, so that projects determined and executed by the people concerned could be financed, was not helping oneself but asking for hand outs. I pointed out that the Maritime Provinces do exactly this when they get a larger share of the Federal taxes than do other provinces, as do small towns which need help with municipal works. When I said that trying to reallocate resources which were accidentally concentrated in some peoples' hands was not begging there was a lot of "ah ha--that's right" in the room. We got into a consideration of finances of the C Y C as some expressed continual amazement that 2.4 million dollars could be spent annually on some 150 people. Near the end of the class I asked them to consider what they would do with that much money if they were the Federal cabinet minister in charge of programs to alleviate poverty. This led to a discussion of the merits of welfare and other problems of employment. The usual focus of debate, between Miles and Fred, was not present during this class possibly because Fred was so much more interested in the transcription of the speech I had distributed earlier.

January 30 : The class opened with Sam and Fred describing a panel discussion which they had attended on the weekend, and which I had announced last class. Gord mentioned an article on community development which had recently appeared in the local newspaper. I asked the class if they would like to have come to the next session a friend of mine who worked with the welfare department in the city as a researcher. He would be able to discuss aspects of that department's work re-

lated to the problems we had been talking about last session. This agreed, I distributed transcripts of the speech on youth to people who had been absent from the last class. Perhaps this led Carol to recall an item about drugs on a popular public affairs show which was broadcast every Sunday evening on television. Several others of us had seen it and the discussion centred on drugs for the next three-quarters of an hour. Since Miles was not at this meeting (yet) and since the topic was drugs, Fred became the chief talker, answering questions and criticisms of the "drug scene." During a lull, Barbara who was particularly well dressed that day said quietly, "oh, I almost forgot happy New Year everybody." The Chinese community had received a fair amount of publicity about its current New Year celebrations and everybody was quite pleased that this girl of Chinese descent had included them in the celebrations. The discussion immediately turned to asking questions of her about her background, China and the Chinese community here in Edmonton. When at one point she said that she did not know too much about these things, Eleanore asked if there was somebody in the Chinese community here who might talk with the class. The discussion wandered and Miles came in and became an active participant. A fair amount of the discussion centred on the difference between the United States and Canada with regard to differences in the attitudes of minority groups in the respective countries. At one point, Barbara made reference to 'you Canadians' and when questioned about this said that she didn't consider herself a Canadian, much to most peoples' surprise, and in turn to her surprise at their surprise. This led to a discussion on race and nationality which concluded with my suggestion

that we bring an anthropologist in to straighten out some of our confusions. Gord said that he would rather see a movie. At the close of the class, I reminded them of next week's speaker and had it clarified that Barbara was going to find somebody from the Chinese community to speak to us. Miles said he wanted to hear it "from the horses' mouth" about conditions today in the People's Republic of China and did not want to concentrate (as I did) on talking about the organization of the local Chinese community.

Period 3 :

February 1 : The researcher with the welfare department came as arranged and talked about the functions of welfare. It came out that he also was somewhat knowledgeable about drugs, and about the last half of the class was spent discussing this issue. After class, the fellow said to me that he was interested in coming back to discuss the issue with the class on a more authoritative basis.

February 6 : For about 20 minutes, the mechanics of the coming field-trip to the Hutterite colony, the proposed continuation of the course next year, the proposed visit of Barbara's father to talk on the Chinese community, and sources on race were discussed. During this time, the researcher from the welfare department came into the class believing that we had arranged this. The rest of the class was spent on drugs, with the discussion focussing on a recent report put out by a group of professional researchers. There was also discussion on theories of therapy.

February 8 : There was a brief discussion about the coming visit to the Hutterite colony. I mentioned the books on reserve in the

library which pertained to Hutterites. There was a brief discussion--mostly very critical--of teachers in the Education Faculty. I asked them if they ever worried about being criticized by their own students when they became teachers. They replied that they deserved to be if they taught that badly, and continued with the criticism. I asked for their definition of a good teacher. Miles replied briefly "one you can understand" and the discussion returned to their own teachers. I felt that they were implicitly explaining to each other what they did not like in teachers from these concrete examples. Despite my prodding, there was no inclination to abstract these generalizations. The graduate student expert on Hutterites came into the class and ended this discussion. The remaining forty minutes of the class were spent talking with him.

February 13 : It had been arranged that Barbara's father would come to this class, and the whole period was spent discussing China, Chinese religions and the Chinese in Canada.

February 15 : The session started with a spontaneous discussion on numerous topics. Ralph was not there, and the discussion was dominated by Fred and Miles who were generally arguing against each other. After a while, Eleanor asked "what did you guys think about the Hutterite colony?" The discussion centered on the Hutterites for about half-an-hour. The comparison was made between Hippies and Hutterites and Fred noted an important distinction between the two cultures in that the Hutterite society is based on an authoritarian structure while the Hippies have no leaders and "do their thing". This led to a discussion on the nature of social control and leadership, at which

point I briefly presented Weber's categorization of leadership types. The discussion continued on the application of this typology to the Hutterites and Hippies. There was a brief period of discourse on the nature of anarchism and the session ended considering the place of minority groups in our society, using the Hutterities as a case example. The atmosphere of the class was excited with a lot of interrupting and shouting down each other. I felt tense about the atmosphere. However, as Miles left he said "a very productive discussion." Barbara spoke to me after class complaining that the class was "dull". She seemed to believe that it was a problem more of the topics than of the process. She found the Hutterites a boring topic, but since we had just been talking with her father the class before, I thought that it might be something deeper than a matter of topics and that given my anxiety about the class as well, that I should try to talk about the whole matter the next time we met.

February 20 : After a few minutes of bantering, I said that a couple of people last time had said that they found the class was getting dull. Miles and others said they found things were getting lively, then Miles initiated a suggestion that we listen to some of the tapes of past classes for the fun of it. Before any decision was made on this, the bantering resumed for about ten minutes and I suggested that maybe there were some basic problems we might discuss. I said that I was concerned with the dynamics of the group, not in terms of the decision-making processes as we had discussed several weeks ago, (January 23), but in terms of the lack of seriousness and intellectual content in the discussions. I asked if any others felt the same way and about

four others indicated that they did. Eleanore suggested that perhaps listening to the tapes would help, and we did so. We listened to excerpts from the last session, and everybody was struck by the hostility in the discussions and the dominance of Fred and Miles. They asked to hear excerpts from one of the other two groups. The tape available was on the last Tuesday's session of the Mixed class. This particular session of that group happened to provide clear contrast in terms of the amount of listening and seriousness of discussion. It seemed to be evident to most people that there were things which could be improved in the Education class.

February 22 : The class started immediately discussing the tape excerpts which we had heard at the last session. Sam said that the Mixed class sounded pretty good in comparison. Ralph said that he did not think that they were accomplishing that much more. I tried to place it in the perspective as being not a question of which class was better but a question of what the dynamics of the two groups were, and in our case, how we could improve things. Miles, Ralph, Gord and Carol resisted at the beginning. They felt that we had had enough of such discussion and that it was too "personal". I kept urging such a discussion mostly to alleviate my own frustrations about the class's process but also to help get as much learning out of the situation as possible. Laura criticized our tendency to put things in terms of group dynamics, when she felt that it was simply a matter of bad manners. Carol and Ralph resisted for some time on the basis that it was up to the individual how he acted, and there was nothing that could be done about that. The whole class was spent discussing the class itself,

and different people suggested reasons for the difficulties we face: the class is too big, we do not really listen to each other, we are all under tension, etc. Periodically Carol, Ralph and Miles suggested we drop the discussion, although from about the middle of the class on Ralph began urging the validity of the discussion to Miles and Carol, mostly on the basis that I felt the need for it. The discussion included an attempt on the part of some, chiefly myself, to convince others, chiefly Ralph and Miles, that one could learn about teaching from understanding the situation in this class. In the course of this discussion, Ralph presented a good analysis of our role taking and role playing, and initiated a good discussion on this. At the official end of the period, but before anybody else made a move to leave, Miles walked out looking rather miffed. The atmosphere of the class was one of listening, little raising of the voice, and much less giggling than usual. A number of people including a couple of the quieter ones stayed after class to continue the discussion.

February 27 : Between the time of the last class and this one, I had been informed that there were to be no classes on this day at this time because of student elections. I was also asked to participate in an assembly which was scheduled for this time. I left a message in the small groups lab in case any people did come. I felt badly when I found that most had come expecting a class, including apparently Miles who was quite angry about the last class.

February 29 : The class started spontaneously discussing the latest campus issue: the establishment of a booth by a group of students to disseminate information on birth control to students. The "pros"

and "cons" of this move were discussed. (Interestingly, nobody who spoke opposed the idea that students should have access to this information and that they should decide their own moral code, even though a number of students in the class were Roman Catholic and personally against contraception.) There was no mention of the last class and its tensions.

March 5 : The class started by discussing the recent Students' Union meeting called to begin protests against the announced tuition fee increase. The rest of the class was spent discussing the issue itself, including what students could do to change the situation. This involved a general discussion on power including some talking by myself on the American civil rights movement and the rationale for civil disobedience. Near the end of the class there was some fantasizing about tactics the students could use to prevent the fee increase being carried out.

March 7 : The class began again on the issue of the tuition fee increase. Other campus issues including a booth set up by some students to disseminate information on birth control, "a peace and quiet" group established to stop radicals from using the Students' Union Building, and the recent student election, were also raised. The discussion was wide-ranging and intellectually undisciplined. It depressed me that our recent talk about the class process seemed to be of no avail, yet on reflection the atmosphere seemed appropriate to the heady state of affairs on the campus at the time.

March 12 : There was a discussion at the beginning of the class about the march being held that afternoon to protest the tuition fee

increase. Spirits were high. Sam was opposed to the march on the grounds that it wasn't militant enough. A good deal of discussion was directed toward changing his mind about not coming. I raised the question of how marks were going to be decided and what was going to be done for the final examination. They informed me that they had already decided to give themselves their own mark individually, a decision which I had not recalled making but one which everybody seemed to agree on. Decisions on the final examination were made, and examinations in other courses were discussed. I asked them for my own interest what they thought about the Education Faculty. To get an idea of how everybody felt, I went to the blackboard and set up a five point scale. They found the answers interesting and suggested I put up other scales: how people found university generally, how they found the academic work, etc. Fred suggested we also ask questions about how people feel about society and the results led to a general discussion of alienation. The discussion focussed on Miles, the only person to rate society as "very good". There was an opportunity to ask the quieter members of the class why they chose the ratings they did. Carol asked for a definition of "society" and a fairly long presentation by myself on the sociological definition of "culture", and "society". The discussion moved onto questions of socialization, propaganda, social change etc. At one point people started indicating that they couldn't believe anything they read, and this led to a presentation by myself on objectivity in the social sciences. Miles still felt that he could only say how he felt about his own immediate environment because he hadn't experienced other places. The discussion

continued on the question of "how do we know?". The atmosphere was thoughtful with the occasional asking clarification of others.

March 14 : At the beginning of the class, Miles suggested that we visit the local mental hospital. I informed the class that the Arts class had, after much effort, only been able to get a few people into the hospital for a visit. Carol suggested that we visit the local school for the blind, and agreed, on my suggestion, to look into that for us. Laura suggested that we might visit a local reformatory, and again I had to point out that previous inquiries have indicated that this would be impossible. Miles and others knew something about the local girls' reformatory and we talked about this for a while. This led to a discussion on curfews and then to a discussion on police. An argument developed mostly between Miles and the rest about whether our society is just or not, with Miles claiming that this society is as just as it can be. The discussion turned to a discussion of Tuesday's protest march by students protesting the raise in tuition fees. I tried to link the frustrations that the class felt about the march to an understanding of the even greater problems faced by the poor in trying to change governmental policies. Because I was planning to hand out questionnaires at the end of the period, I asked somebody to notify me when there was five minutes left in the period. This touched off a final 15-minute discussion on discipline in the high school classroom. This led to my distinguishing (as I had in more detail earlier in the year) between the behaviorist and "existential" schools of psychological thought.

Period 4 :

March 19 : For the sake of the experiment I suggested to the class that the very last day be devoted to their discussing, without my presence, the class during the year. I asked whether they intended to come to class the last week of term or whether we should cancel that week's classes. They all planned some come that last week. Other arrangements for ending the year were made. Barbara and others wondered why I was going to stay out of the last classes, and my explanation that some people might feel better about evidence regarding the feelings of the people in the course if it is garnered in this way, did not satisfy them. They insisted that they would talk just as frankly were I there or not. Dave wondered about the basis on which they should assign themselves marks, and I had to honestly say that I could not help him decide this. I assumed that most people would judge themselves on the basis of their effort in the class, but what this meant in practise was just another difficult question. This discussion finished, I brought up for discussion a program of the television series "Twenty-First Century" which I had seen the night before. The program was about brain control and drug-induced intelligence and this raised to me the question of who was going to control this process. Several others had seen the same program and we discussed it for the rest of the period. Tangents to the discussion ran off on halucionogenic drugs with the focus on Fred, and on socialization through the education system. The central question was: what is the proper place of technology in our society?

March 21 : The class agreed to allow a graduate student in psychology to use them as subjects for an experiment he was conducting on the effects of different media. After the experiment, the class discussed his experiment and the theory of Marshall McLuhan on which it was based.

March 26 : After about five minutes of chit-chat, Sam and Miles started talking about the movie "Summerhill" which had been shown in the Education Faculty recently. It was agreed that I should arrange to have it shown in class. We talked about another film being shown in the Education Faculty and contemporary commercial motion pictures being shown in town. Fred and Eleanore suggested that the class see "Guess Who's Coming to Dinner" and then discuss it, but there was no serious decision on this. The conversation moved onto popular music, and Fred talked about the message in some of the new songs. For the first time in the history of the class, there was a fairly long silence (over a minute-and-a-half) which was finally broken by Fred who asked if anybody had something to discuss, "or are we just going to sit here?" Alice asked people's opinions about a show on Haight-Ashbury which was shown on television recently. Most of the rest of the class was spent discussing drugs, hippies and for a short while alcohol, (the latter also on the basis of a recent television program.) We talked some about the possible impact of drugs and the hippy sub-culture on society as a whole, which involved a brief presentation on Marx by myself. Surprising myself, I started talking about my own feelings on the uselessness of academic life given the problems the world faces. I was surprised that I was thinking it so strongly and that I felt free to

confide in the class, and perhaps surprised that they listened to these feelings. In the process of talking I mentioned that the Mixed class had gone downtown that morning and talked to some local hippies. After class Eleanor and Barbara suggested that next session we should go downtown.

March 28 : There was a brief ranging discussion, in part on a welfare case which Carol brought up. Barbara asked if we were going to go downtown, and the class decided it would. We walked around and I discussed the morphology of the core of the city in terms of the economic and social pressures operating.

April 2 : The movie "Summershill" was shown, as previously arranged. The rest of the class was spent discussing the film. A number of people thought that the school looked quite nice but that there did not seem to be much learning going on. We discussed the nature of learning. Ralph, who was majoring in music talked about the difference between natural musical talent and learned musicianship.

April 4 : Neither Miles, Ralph, nor Fred was at this class. I thought that this would be a good opportunity to try to find some topics which were interesting to the quiet members of the class. Since the division between rural and urban students (in high school) was virtually the same as the division between the least verbal and the most verbal students, we found some value in discussing primarily among the least verbal, rural students, the difference between urban and rural life. I presented Toennies distinction to them during the course of the discussion.

April 9 : As previously arranged, on my initiative, two movies

on the phenomenon of the modern city were shown. The few minutes remaining in the period were spent discussing the points made in the film as they pertained to Edmonton.

April 11 : The class began discussing current popular movies, then quickly resumed discussing the movies which had been shown at the last class. While most thought that there were many undesirable features about the modern city, Gord suggested that perhaps the city showed most dramatically what is wrong with society. For example, he said, "look at the race problems in the United States." This provoked a discussion on race problems. Some local examples of discrimination were mentioned by members of the class. We discussed the origin of prejudice, including the question of whether it was natural or not. This produced a broader discussion on the nature of normality and I pointed out the distinction between normality as a statistical concept and normality as a clinical concept. The class finished discussing Martin Luther King, who had just been assassinated, and the relationship between him and other sections of the United States civil rights movement. I outlined various sections' theories of social change.

April 16 : Details about the necessary final examination were straightened out, then Gord asked if others had seen the local television documentary of the night before on the subject of prostitution for wayward girls. A few had and details of this program were discussed. After a time, Ralph said with some emotion that he couldn't see getting upset about these people. "Why should I worry about them when they're on welfare". The discussion focussed on his feelings about this. The problems faced by the Indian in this society were discussed, and this

led into the means being used by the Negroes in the United States to attack their problems. I suggested a number of biographies by Negroes which would be worth reading to get a feeling for the frustrations they faced. After a time, Barbara asked about Rudi Dutshke, the German youth leader, and we talked about the reasons for and meaning of the surge of youth movements around the world. The mood of the class was thoughtful, open and concerned.

April 19 : As previously arranged, I did not participate in this session in order to allow them to discuss by themselves a series of questions regarding the class which I had prepared for them. The questions were read by different people and rather hastily dispensed with. In general, the students felt that the class had been democratic in the sense that I had intended.

The Mixed Class

Period 1 :

October 3 : I began by saying that I preferred a method of teaching which encouraged the students to decide what should be learned, on the basis of what was meaningful to them, rather than the lecture method. I said that I would be a resource person, for the time being that I would be the chairman, and in general that I would regard myself as an equal member of the class with the same rights and responsibilities as the rest. George asked me what sociology was. When I turned the question back to him, he said he thought it was about the relationships between people in various societies. I said that I thought that that was a workable definition, and asked for other ideas

on the meaning of sociology from other people. None came forth. I suggested that everybody in the class identify himself or herself, state why they took the sociology course and explain what they understood by sociology when they signed up. Reg was the only person to explain what he understood the term sociology meant, and to him it was "groups rather than individuals". After the introduction, I asked the class what they would like to study. George suggested discussing "Frosh Week" which had been a disappointment to him. The rest of the class quickly proclaimed their objections to this idea. A substantive discussion developed on the subject of fraternities, then sports etc. After about an hour, a latecomer arrived. After the disturbance I suggested that we had been talking about a number of important sociological problems: initiation, primary groups, duty and privilege. I suggested that we pick some topic, then study it and talk about it in a more disciplined way. Fraternities were suggested as a topic, but this suggestion was followed by silence. I asked how we were going to decide matters like this. When this question was met with silence too, I suggested that here was another important sociological problem: decision making in small groups. I suggested that one method is that if nobody opposes a suggestion it is accepted. Since nobody opposed studying fraternities, we concluded that this was the topic for now and began discussing methodology. This brought up issues such as: how does one get data from secret organizations, sampling, ethics, participant observation and the role perspectives of different fraternity members. We decided that we should individually probe the area for the next few days. At the end of this first session, I was quite excited and impres-

sed with the questions which were raised by the students, and the way in which we were able to get to so many important points from such an informal discussion.

October 5 : I began the session by asking what people had found out about fraternities. Dale said that he still was not sure how marks were to be assigned in this course. For some time we discussed the issue of whether we should talk about this matter at this time. Some felt that we should decide now, others said that we should relax and worry about more important things. I said that I could understand how some would be worried about marks, and talked about the anxiety which is created when one knows what the goals are in an institution but is prevented from knowing the means to reach those goals. Dale finally conceded the point to the rest of the class, however. Others began asking what we were going to do in the course, "just sit around and talk?" I presented my theory that people will eventually get tired of just sitting around and will eventually want to get involved in creative and disciplined work. This instigated a long discussion on work, leisure and labour. I was prompted by the discussion to think of Marx and Sebastian de Grazia's theory of leisure. The discussion was so lively, however, I did not get a chance to talk. With five minutes left in the session, Dean said "well let's get organized". A number of people said that we should settle on studying fraternities. Discussion began immediately on how the class was going to do this. I interrupted this planning and said that we should give the quieter members of the class an opportunity to express their opinion on the worth of the topic. I asked the less verbal people around the room what they thought.

While some were not enthusiastic, nobody had any better ideas, and so it was decided that the class study fraternities.

October 10 : The session began with a slow discussion on fraternities. Kate had picked up a bulletin from the Pan-Hellenic Society (which represents all girls' "fraternities") and parts of this were read to the class. We narrowed the question down to the role of fraternities on campus. We discussed the claim in the pamphlet that girls in fraternities do better academically because they are able to talk over academic problems with their "big sisters". I asked how a claim like this would be tested. There was little response and I talked for about twenty minutes on experimental design. Further methodological discussion led to a suggestion that the class draw up a questionnaire and issue it to fraternity members. This idea was greeted with enthusiasm.

October 12 : We began drawing up the questionnaire, and I found myself in the position of leader as I wrote ideas on the blackboard. I asked for somebody to volunteer as scribe for the class. When no offers were made I asked one of the quieter boys near me to do this job. We established the basic questions we wanted answered. We began talking about the form of the questionnaire we wanted to employ, and I talked about the relative merits of open-ended questions and "objective" questions. I explained the concept of pre-testing. I found it necessary later in the session to explain it again on two different occasions. I began to wonder how much was actually being communicated when I talked at length in these sessions. Many of the class seemed bored with the whole matter. There was some talking in small groups which

bothered me, but which I tried to ignore. After the class I asked a number of students if they found this session boring. They said that they did but that we had to do this to carry out the questionnaire. After the session I thought that I should ask the question of the whole class.

October 17 : The session started with the scribe reading the items which were suggested in the last class for the questionnaire. I asked Lyle to write on the blackboard during this session. This allowed me to participate without feeling the need to keep things organized. We talked about the various forms the questionnaires might take, with a series of paired responses being the form decided on. The discussion seemed interesting to all, and many people expressed amazement that there were so many issues to be resolved in the formulation of a good questionnaire.

October 19 : At the beginning of the session I sarcastically read out a "memorandum on attendance" which had been sent to all teachers in the University. I was surprised that several students asked seriously what the attendance standard for this class was. I talked about the logic of the Guttman scale, about the nominal, ordinal and interval scales. I asked Godfrey to write suggested questions on the board. After some time he became angry that there was so little attention being paid to the task that we had set ourselves. His anger was received with laughter but with respect. We worked out more of the details on the questionnaire.

October 24 : At the beginning of the session, I read a memorandum to instructors in the Department of Sociology notifying them

that there was money available in the Departmental budget for the funding of field trips. There was a great deal of excitement about this, although most ideas were highly fanciful. Finally, we returned to constructing the questionnaire. Many were uninvolved, and at this point a couple of them asked "what are we doing anyway?" Godfrey explained the activity to them. The remainder of the session was spent in a discussion of the logic of sampling.

October 26 : The session began with a discussion of the field trip again. One of the students had access to a bus, and again there was fanciful discussion of various possibilities for field trips such as investigating the skiing conditions in the mountains. After about fifteen minutes, I suggested that we keep thinking about possible field trips, but that for the immediate future we continue with the questionnaire. We decided the composition of various interviewing teams. It was decided that boys would go to the girls' fraternities and vice versa. The actual composition of the teams was based on considerations of prestige. Among the boys, a hierarchy of prestige seemed to decide the choices for pairs, while among the girls the four "most swinging" quickly assigned themselves as a group. Final arrangements for contacting fraternities were made.

October 31 : I offered advice about the approach people should take when issuing the questionnaires. We worked out final arrangements for making the contacts. The coming week of tests in other courses was somehow mentioned, and I asked if people intended to come to this class, or if it should be cancelled. At first there was no understanding of my point. Finally they said that they did not intend to miss classes

in this course during that week. We were now finishing the time needed in class for the preparation of the questionnaire for the fraternities, and I became anxious about what we could do from here. Searching for a topic, I suggested that we should broaden our concern with small groups to study the theory of them. Lyle replied that he thought we should move in the other direction. That is, instead of studying abstractions, we should study another group in depth. There were murmurs of assent. He suggested that one interesting group would be the Hutterites. People became very excited and started discussing this culture. I interrupted to ask if everybody wanted to discuss some group in detail, as Lyle had suggested. All agreed. I asked if the Hutterites were the most interesting to them. Lyle suggested that another possibility would be the Indians. There were a few prejudicial remarks, and most seemed to feel that the Hutterites would be more interesting. Godfrey had contact with a Hutterite colony near Edmonton through farm business. He undertook to arrange a field trip for November 18, a Saturday. I suggested that we ask the graduate student expert in the Department to talk with us about the ways of the Hutterites before we went.

November 2 : I entered the class with a great deal of anxiety about the class. I did not know what we were going to do in the sessions between now and the trip to the Hutterite colony. My notes written that night say, "I actually thought we should call it off for a while." I finally decided that since I didn't have anything to say, I would say nothing until called upon by somebody else. After about five minutes one of the girls near me started talking about her experience at the fraternities. We talked between ourselves, for there were many

side-conversations going on. After about ten minutes, there was a suggestion that we "talk about something". I suggested that we wait until we all could talk together. Gradually the class quieted down. I said that I had had some experience with a group, the Doukhobors, which might be interesting to compare with the Hutterites. I felt somewhat miffed when they said that they would rather not hear about them until after visiting the Hutterites. We talked about the questions which we would be asking when we visited the Hutterite colony. Brad's father was a minister who had had a great deal of contact with the Hutterites. I suggested that he interview his father on a tape-recorder and bring the tape to class. Everybody thought that that was a good idea. We set ourselves the goal of a week to complete the interview with the fraternities.

November 7 : We talked about the experiences in issuing the questionnaires, about three-quarters of which had already been completed. Many people found that their subjects complained about having to make a forced choice. Again, I talked about the assumption of the ordinal scale underlying the employment of this type of questionnaire. This assumption would be useful to check on the observation by some of the girls that the boys who filled out their questionnaires were "fooling around". The field trip to the Hutterite colony had been set up for November 18, and Brad had brought the taped interview with his father which we listened to. I presented some of the information I had acquired about Hutterites and asked them how they thought it was that this cultural enclave could survive in North America. I presented some references which I said that I would arrange to place "on reserve" in

the library.

November 9 : There were about 6 absent during this class, presumably because of the test-week which was to start for other courses the next day. I had to inform the Department about any plans for an examination in January. I asked the students about this and they said that they did not want one. I mentioned that an acquaintance of one of the girls in the class had asked to join the class, (which I had refused to allow), or at least to join the class on field trips. They did not want him to join the class for field trips, for as some said only half in jest, "we're an exclusive group". Some people had obtained books on the Hutterites. I asked people to attend the class a week from the coming Tuesday, because I had questionnaires to issue to them in connection with the study I was doing. This led to a discussion of social science in general. The ethics of the social scientist were raised when some complained about a compulsory psychological test all first year students were given as they registered in the University. It appeared to be a test based on the A-S scale of Adorno, and they complained about all the "anti-Jewish questions". Near the end of the session, Dale asked why the class was going to the Hutterite colony. I was beginning to answer when one of the quieter girls asked with some intensity, why the class had studied fraternities. The session ended before any full answer could be made. I was impressed with the fact that this was the first sign of questioning and independence in the class.

November 14 : The session started slowly. Some of the questionnaires were not yet in: the ones from the two girls who were closely associated with fraternities and from one of the quietest

girls. I asked Dale, who was sitting outside the circle around the table, because of lack of space, whether his question had been adequately answered at the last session. He said yes, that studying the Hutterites puts our culture in perspective. Kate also felt that we had answered her. The sub-group discussion continued, and Dale said that he could see why we had trouble as a class. He suggested that we start to analyze the questionnaires. I agreed for myself and asked if others agreed. A few did, but some students were still talking among themselves. I attempted in a non-hostile way to suggest to the rest that they should participate in making the decisions. I went to the board and explained how we could check questionnaires for internal consistency. I had difficulty expressing my point, and again had to reprimand, as gently as possible, people for talking. Barry and Vivian, who had been talking together, however, came up with a better way of checking the questionnaires for internal consistency. I doubted it, but they proved their point. The remainder of the session was spent scoring the questionnaires.

November 16 : We continued scoring the questionnaires until the graduate student expert on Hutterites arrived to talk with us. The class became quite interested in what he had to say. After the class, I asked him to come back on Tuesday after the field trip. Later I felt that this was an example of my tendency to make decisions without consulting the class.

November 21 : We talked about the very exciting visit we had made to the Hutterite colony on Saturday. We had been split into various groups there, and the discussion was mostly one of relating

experiences to each other. I tried to lead into a more analytical discussion by asking questions such as "would you like to live there?" "are they happy?" etc. The graduate student expert on Hutterites did not arrive, but I apologized for having invited him without having asked for their agreement. I handed out the first set of questionnaires for this study.

November 23 : Some of my questionnaires were handed back. Dale and Vivian said that people may be dishonest in their replies for my sake. Others disagreed. The class started slowly with a lot of sub-group discussion. Several of us at one end started talking about sociology and university education. After about ten minutes the discussion broadened out to include everyone. Most of the session was spent complaining about the university system. Because the students in Physical Education were dominating the discussion, I asked the girls in Household Economics what they thought about their courses. They expressed a number of very strong feelings about their work. At the end of the session, Lyle said that we should finish the questionnaires. The class reluctantly agreed.

November 30 : With a distinct lack of enthusiasm, the class agreed to finish the questionnaires. I wrote the results on the blackboard, and asked the class what we could do with the data. There was disdain for fraternities expressed by the non-fraternity members of the class, while Dale the one boy in a fraternity and the two girls associated with them talked among themselves in the corner. Barry suggested that data would be more useful if we had the scores in percentages or some other standard score. He agreed to take on the task

of computing these. As the session ended, I asked the class if they would like to talk with the graduate student expert on Hutterites again. They quickly said "yes".

November 30 : Barry had worked out the statistics, and I left to have them duplicated. Returning, I suggested that we discuss the figures from the blackboard. A few unwillingly agreed, but most passively resisted by talking periodically among themselves. After about forty minutes, our visitor came and the remainder of the session was spent discussing the Hutterites. After class, I thought that we should talk about the class process together at the next meeting. I felt hostility coming from two directions: the students who wanted to work hard, and those who didn't want to be bored. Also, the three students associated with fraternities seemed threatened by our talking about fraternities.

Period 2 :

December 5 : The session started in the same way as it had for the last few weeks: with a lot of talking within sub-groups. Barry had passed out the copies of the statistical report on fraternities which he had compiled. Some people were looking at these. After about five minutes, I said that I had this problem in that I needed structure in a learning situation, and that I found the sub-group discussions and the lack of planning ahead bothersome. We began talking about the class structure. At one point, one girl was talking and others were talking across the table to each other. Later Dean asked what I was really concerned about. I replied that I thought that because we were not

thinking hard enough about what we really wanted to do and how we could do it, we were on topics like fraternities which apparently did not interest us, and that led to sub-group discussions. I told them about last Thursday's Arts class which had decided, (so I thought at the time,) to discuss existentialism because they were concerned with the meaning of life. These students replied that they would like to go on more field trips. They said that they had gotten out of fraternities, as a topic, what they wanted, and that now they wanted to study new things. Vivian suggested that the class ask the graduate student expert on Hutterites to return but most others felt that they had run out of things to talk about with him. I suggested that she see the man, herself. By the end of the session, it was established that we would attend more field trips. It was suggested that we should tour the Provincial jail.

December 7 : Some difficulties arose at the last minute for me, and I was forced to call the class to tell that I would be unable to come. Apparently some stayed during the session anyway, but did not discuss anything directly related to the topics we had been discussing in class. I told Lyle who came to the phone, that a fellow graduate student had asked me to talk to his class and that he in turn might be useful to our class as he was knowledgeable about the prison system.

December 12 : The first half of the session was spent making arrangements to have the graduate student come on a Thursday, and establishing days on which people could go to the jail. Some students seemed amused that I was taking so much time to see if the arrangements we made were satisfactory to the class as a whole. There was silence,

then a discussion grew on the role of jails in our society. The class decided to meet the last day of term.

December 14 : The graduate student came to the class to talk about jails. I had given him a tape of a recent television show on the subject, which one of the students in the Arts class had obtained.

December 19 : We made final arrangements for touring the jail. I asked them if they would like to hear from a professor who had directed an experimental project for juvenile delinquents. He had spoken last Thursday to the Arts class, and they had found him very interesting. It was arranged that he should come the first day back in the new year. A number of people expressed enthusiasm about the speaker at the last session. I asked what he had said. There was no answer. A number of people said that they were impressed with the expressions he had used. Lyle mentioned that he had talked about an "open prison system" in California, and then described such a system he had heard of in Canada. We debated whether criminals should be punished or rehabilitated. When Jill said that if people were still poor there would still be robbery no matter what kind of rehabilitation system existed, we began talking about the social conditions leading to crime.

January 4 : The professor who had conducted a project with juvenile delinquents came to talk. The reception was much less warm than had been the case with the Arts class. It was my interpretation that this was in large part because it was the first session after the Christmas holidays and that people were too restless. The class agreed to meet in the small groups lab.

January 9 : The professor in charge of the small groups lab

showed the class around. The remainder of the session was spent discussing the experiences of those of us who had gone to the jail the day before.

January 11 : The session began with further making of arrangements for the rest of the class to visit the jail. Dean asked if there were to be any continuations of this class. I said "no" and we talked about my plans and about sociology courses in the senior years. Lyle asked, "what do you think of most profs on campus?" and this led to a general discussion of my ideas on pedagogy and the university system. We began talking about teachers in general and many students gave examples from their own high school days. We finished the session on the topic of social control, and on the topic of roles such as of the female teacher in the lower grades.

January 23 : We made arrangements for the last tours of the jail. I talked about some films on poverty which had been previewed in the Department a few days ago. There was no clear indication that people wanted to see these. I reminded them of the discussion which we had had last time on teachers, and some of the questions which had been raised in the course of this discussion. I drew the parallel between the student needing to affirm his dignity by playing pranks on the teacher, and "the tough guy lipping a cop". We talked on this for a while, then proceeded to discuss left-wing ideologies when Dale asked, "if self-esteem is related to socio-economic status, why doesn't communism work?" This led me to talk for about 30 minutes on Marx. In setting him in historical perspective, I talked about positivism. I talked about modern sociology, evolutionary socialism, racism, etc.

When I finished Barry countered with some conservative ideas about the source of self-esteem. The class debated these ideologies for the remainder of the session.

January 25 : I announced a panel discussion on "youth protests" being held the coming Sunday. I also made reference to some contemporary magazine articles on prisons. Vivian had looked up in the encyclopedia references to socialism and communism and read those to the class. Barry replied on the basis of some ideas he had worked out since the last meeting. This initiated a discussion on ideology which continued for the remainder of the session.

January 30 : Barry had brought to class books of Ayn Rand. Dale brought up the ideological discussion again, referring to items in his philosophy text which he thought were relevant. Vivian suggested that we should talk about the jail again, now that all had been there. I asked the people who had been there recently to tell us what things they had noticed. We talked about the effect of the impersonalization on prisoners, and broadened the matter to the present nature and impact of bureaucracy elsewhere, such as in the university. I announced a forthcoming panel discussion on criminology.

Period 3 :

February 1 : Margaret asked if we were getting the films which I had mentioned on January 23 as having been previewed in the Department. I said that I had been waiting for a reaction when I mentioned them, and that since nobody asked to have them brought, I didn't know whether they were wanted or not. After checking to see that other

people also wanted to see them, I said that I would get them as soon as I could. Lyle came in just as this was decided and mentioned a local campus event which resulted in a short discussion on kicklines as publicity gimmicks for student events. Linda asked: what are we going to do today. Dean checked to see if we had finished the discussion on jails and we reviewed the various topics which had been raised and where we had left them. Lyle said that he had been talking to a friend last night who claimed that nobody could fail in university if he were in the right courses for him. People reacted strongly and a long discussion ensued, centred on Lyle, on whether a university degree was worth anything. During the course of the discussion, Lyle explained that the night before he had listened for two hours without saying anything while his room-mate and a friend argued about this. He kept referring back to this discussion. After a while I suggested that the question we were addressing ourselves to was: what are the aims of education. Lyle said immediately that it was to aid society, which led to a discussion of things which did or did not aid society. One of the questions was: "is not aiding society coincidental with breaking the law?" This led to a discussion of morality beyond the law, toward which new laws are changed, and hence to a discussion of progress and its meaning. Questions of cultural lag, the role and nature of law, were raised. Idealist and materialist conceptions of history were variously presented which induced me to define these a little more clearly and to link them to Weber and Marx in a ten-minute presentation. A discussion of Nazi Germany as a questionable case of progress led to a third theory, "the great man" theory, when Dale said that Nazi Germany was a

product solely of Hitler. The nature of fascism, (and comparatively, communism) was discussed. The discussion returned to, and finished on, the question of progress, particularly technological progress.

February 6 : I reported that the films I had mentioned before were not immediately available, and that in their place I had arranged for a movie produced in the early 1950's on juvenile delinquency to be shown on Thursday. The last of the second batch of questionnaires were handed back, and we talked about them. I said that I had looked briefly through the comments and reported that some felt that there was too much domination of the class by a few. We discussed this issue for about half the class. People seemed interested in hearing each others' views and some of the more highly verbal people professed to have learned as a result of the discussion. During the discussion, I talked about role-taking and other phenomena of small groups. During the discussion, Kate said that she would like to see us visit a juvenile court so that we could continue pursuing this question of crime. Others said that it would be more democratic if we planned ahead like that so that informal leaders did not determine where the class was to go in spontaneous discussions. Dale said that he was still concerned about how marks were going to be assigned, and that speaking truthfully for himself, he participated with this in the back of his mind. He thought that if the class could finally decide how marks were going to be assigned he would feel less pressure to dominate discussions. We decided that the session after the next one (which films were planned for) would be devoted to planning future sessions and deciding the process by which marks were going to be assigned.

February 8 : The film was shown. For the remaining few minutes, people expressed their shock at the lack of depth in the film. Several pointed out that the hero who was "rehabilitated" in a moderately progressive reform school, was returning to the same problems which had led him into trouble in the first place.

February 13 : We made a long list, according to the rules of brainstorming, of topics which could be discussed by the class in future sessions. I wrote these on the blackboard, then we voted on them to develop some priority. The first five choices were birth control, drinking, The Smug Minority by Pierre Berton, censorship, and my views on education, in that order. We agreed that we should make the final decision on the marks next session when all were here. For the remainder of this session, however, the issue was discussed. The alternatives presented were that all receive the same mark, or that each assign his own mark. Lyle suggested that we have a "trial run" in which each put down on a piece of paper what mark he would assign himself at this moment.

February 15 : All members of the class were present, and we made the final decision on marks. It was decided that each person should assign his own mark. During the remaining hour in the period we discussed the first topic on our list: birth control. A booth had been set up on campus by a group intent on informing all about the methods of birth control, and the procedure for obtaining devices. The discussion started on this booth, using literature being handed out there. The question being asked was whether a girl should take birth control pills before getting married. This led to consideration of group

norms and status. We concluded considering the demographic affects of the pill.

February 20 : I began the session by suggesting that I give an overview of sociological approaches, so that we could place the various topics we were to talk about within a larger context. I contrasted the functional theories of Parson's etc., with the theories of such people as Marx and Etzioni. Dean asked if a subject like birth control was amenable to sociological analysis. He suggested it was more a personal matter. I distinguished between value choices and sociological implications of, and reasons for, certain acts. Again the conversation centred on the consequences of the invention of the birth control pill, and the moral questions associated with it.

February 22 : We talked about the next topic on our list: alcohol and alcoholism. We discussed the reasons for people drinking, in terms of the individual's reasons and the cultural facts behind these reasons. Why prohibition failed was discussed in terms of the conflict between folkways and legislation, and social change. Humorous incidents involving alcohol were shared, then Lyle suggested that we have a good party and see how people really acted when they were drunk. This led to considerations of "on stage" and "back-stage" behaviour, drawing on examples of our tendencies. Different bases for status among boys and girls in terms of drinking ability were discussed.

February 27 : The session began with Dale taking me to task over a comment which I had at a meeting saying that fraternities should cease having special status in the university. We argued about the role of fraternities on campus. After about fifteen minutes, Dale

said "let's get back on the agenda", and we talked about the topics which we had decided to discuss after birth control and alcohol. The Smug Minority was next in order, but since few had read it yet we postponed talking about it until the next week. Lyle read from the list he had made of the topics we had stated we would like to talk about. There was little enthusiasm shown for any of these. Dale asked me a question about campus politics. Before answering him I asked the class if it did not want to talk about some of the previously listed topics. They indicated by continuing to talk about the matter that they would rather talk about campus politics, which we did for the rest of the period. We talked about the issue of tuition fees, arguing about their purpose, their consequences, and whether they provide incentives to work. I talked about different assumptions about human nature which underlie the various positions which people were adopting. This involved talking about Abraham Maslow and the existentialists on the one hand, and the behaviourists and motivation theorists on the other. This brought the discussion back to the question of marks in this class. Dale expressed his personal feelings that he would take advantage of the system I had set up. Others replied that it was because of the total system that he felt he had to take as much as he could get.

February 29 : The session started slowly. I asked if there were any topics on the list we had drawn up which people thought we should discuss. In effect, the class rejected its own list. The conversation was desultory with a number of sub-groups discussions going on, until the class as a whole started discussing the tuition fee issue again. We talked about how the students could stop the raise. This led into a

general discussion of social change and mass movements.

March 5 : As had been previously planned, we spent the session discussing The Smug Minority. Most of the class had read at least parts of the book. Because it employed concrete examples, we were able to talk about cases which were of interest to the class. As usual in discussions on ideology, Barry and George were opposed to the socialistic views of Berton and provided articulate opposition, to others in the class.

March 7 : Almost half the class was absent for this class owing to the mid-term tests which were being written in other courses. I brought up an item in The Smug Minority about Berton's view of progress and this led to our talking briefly about the forthcoming protest march on tuition fees. Barry had brought a sheet from a capitalist tract which he read to the class. The session was devoted to talking about how one "gets ahead" in this society, and conversely about the factors which prevent people from "getting ahead". The discussion continually returned to the problem of tuition fees.

March 12 : The session started slowly with relaxed conversation about various campus social events, semi-serious suggestions about seeing commercial movies as a class project, etc. Dean reported on a recent television show in which Pierre Berton confronted representatives of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, etc. For about ten minutes we talked about Berton's ideas again. The discussion turned to American politics, and from there to the war in Vietnam. This topic was discussed for most of the remainder of the session. I provided historical background information on the war. After the discussion came to a natural end, Jill asked if we were going on any more field

trips. We talked about various possibilities, finally agreeing to visit a court. Margaret volunteered to investigate what arrangements had to be made.

March 14 : Margaret had found about the times when court would be in session and we talked about making a visit. We decided to go at times convenient for us individually. Nobody raised a topic for discussion. We asked Lyle to read from the list, but none of the topics on the list provoked any interest. Vivian asked if people had attended the protest march, and we talked about that. I asked if people thought that there was a generational revolt which in part explained this protest march. We discussed this, and I introduced the thoughts of some Quebec sociologists on this theme. We talked about different sex ethics between generations, and this led in turn to a prolonged discussion on the status of women, and the rate of change in this area. Reg introduced a cyclical theory of history and we talked of social change in connection with the technological innovations such as the birth control pill. At the end of the period, a graduate student in psychology came into the class to ask them to participate in an experiment at the next session. They agreed.

Period 4 :

March 19 : The experiment which had been arranged last session was conducted. It concerned the effect of various forms of media on our perceptions, and after the experiment, the experimenter discussed his project with the class. He introduced them to the thoughts of Marshall McLuhan.

March 21 : The session started with my asking the class what they thought about the ideas which were presented last time in connection with the experiment on the effects of media. They all thought that it was very silly. We talked about McLuhan's ideas, and about the design of the experiment. The latter point led to some discussion of social science research in general. I gave some references to McLuhan's books. Jeanne, one of the quietest girls, said that she could bring one of the books. After about forty minutes on this subject, the topic shifted to flying saucers when sub-groups started talking about these. We talked about the point that television shows portray people from other planets as hostile invaders, and from there about the fact that there is a great deal of implicit propaganda on television shows and commercial films portraying war. The session ended discussing the effect of anxiety about war on people's attitudes.

March 26 : I announced a campus event, then asked how many people had visited the court. None had. Jeanne had brought a copy of McLuhan's book, and lent to one of the more verbal boys who volunteered to talk about it to us at some later date. Some people suggested jokingly that we go for a walk since it was such beautiful weather. I said that I was interested in urbanism, and had been thinking that we should tour downtown sometime. They agreed, with excitement, and we drove downtown to spend about an hour looking at the morphology of the urban core and talking to some "hippies" whom we had met near the library.

March 28 : The first twenty minutes were spent discussing arrangements for the end of the year and for the continuation of the

course in the next year. After some informal conversation in sub-groups, I suggested that we see the film from the National Film Board, in which Lewis Mumford talks about the city. They agreed, laughing, suggesting that going downtown was mostly a lark, and that there was nothing really to be learned about the city. I talked about the urbanization as a trend and about the nature of city life. We quickly began talking about the plight of the Negro in American cities. This led to a discussion on the larger structural problems in the United States today. This involved in part, linking the war in Vietnam to the situation of the Negroes in the cities. This in turn led to discussing the Negro's role in the American army at which time I talked briefly about some of the findings in Stouffer's The American Soldier. The students in Physical Education talked about the problems facing the Negroes in sports. We turned the discussion back to the problems facing the Indian in Canada. In talking about the effects of society on the Indian, we shifted into talking about the general question of the effect of the group on an individual. We finished the session defining the word "group."

April 2 : The session started very slowly. After about ten minutes of conversation in sub-groups, Jill started talking about our inability to develop a topic to talk about. After several minutes of analyzing this, but with no conclusion, a substantive discussion developed on American and Canadian political conventions and international affairs. We talked about "the bomb", the growth of China, Vietnam, and revolution in poor countries. The session ended talking about most people's sense of helplessness confronted by the possi-

bility of being annihilated through events over which they have no control.

April 4 : The films which were to be shown on the city were unavailable. There is no record of this session.

April 9 : The films on the city were shown. The remaining twenty minutes of the session were devoted to discussing the points raised in these films.

April 11 : The session started very slowly. For about half the period, the talking was in sub-groups. Barry, I and two others talked about the nature of sociology for a while, but nobody else was interested. I found this very frustrating. Finally the discussion on the forthcoming political convention involved the whole class. This topic led to considering the assassination of Martin Luther King and the different sections of the civil rights movement. Christine had a friend who was Negro and with whom she had been talking about this. She talked at some length about her friends' perception of the situation. We discussed the difficulty we had in understanding how people in radically different circumstances felt.

April 16 : I began talking about the possibilities for continuing the class next year. This precipitated a discussion of the class itself which continued the whole session. Vivian and Christine wanted to have some text book as the basis of discussion next year. They felt that this year had been valuable in terms of getting experience in this kind of a class and getting to know others, but that more disciplined work should be taken the next year. Dale said that a couple of weeks ago that he had gone through a metamorphosis and had begun to feel that

I was using him as a guinea pig and avoiding my responsibilities to teach him; that I was paying him off, in a sense, by allowing him to assign his own mark. It was a dialogue between the two of us for a while as I explained how I perceived what I was doing. (After the session, Dale explained that he had been worrying about whether he should give himself the top mark possible in the course or not. He felt like an "opportunist" but still wanted the mark.) Jill said that she had been suspicious in the early part of the year that all I had wanted was for the class to like me. The discussion returned to the procedure for next year. Most disagreed that a text book would be a good idea, but most agreed with Kate that we should go into topics more deeply rather than hopping about so much. All agreed that field trips were the best part of the course. I suggested that perhaps we might each undertake to do some research on some topic of interest to us, then lead the class in some investigation of that. This was considered by most to be a good solution to most of our problems.

April 18 : The class met without my being present. They discussed the questions about the course which I had listed. The questions were read off by different people and the rest of the class rather hastily dispensed with them. There was some debate about the degree of informal leadership which existed in the class. After about forty minutes, the discussion came to a close. The remainder of the session was spent organizing a party for the whole class after the examinations. (This party was attended by about half of us.)

Analysis of proceedings

Period 1

Arts Class

Teaching approach

Much more than in the other two classes, my chief concern during this period of the Arts class was to understand what interested the students. From the first session when several people stated that they did not know why they had come to university, until the last session of the period when we talked about the direction of the class, there was no clear interest expressed in discussing a topic for very long. I found this personally frustrating and continually attempted to discover the students' real interests and to maintain some continuity in the discussions. On the last day of the period I thought that I had found that the class wanted to talk about the meaning of life. However, I was to find on December 5, that this was not the case at all.

There were often silent pauses of several minutes' duration in this class. Sometimes I broke this, sometimes I did not. I recommended two books that we read as a class. Although in general I avoided urging decisions on the others, at times I did as in the case of our deciding to read Coming of Age in Samoa.

I presented more sociological theory in this class than in the others. As in the other classes, this was in part to ready them for a test of knowledge which was to be part of the original experiment. It

was also because I found many of these theoretical questions interesting and thought that they should understand some of the larger questions in sociology. While occasionally this proved interesting to them, more often it did not, so far as most were concerned.

Structure of course

There were two attempts to develop some sort of plan to the courses, but these faltered. The first was Jack's suggestion that one person present a topic each week, and lead the discussion about that. However, we never got beyond Jack's contribution. On October 26, we decided to discuss sex for several weeks, then poverty. Matters related to the former topic were considered at several sessions when we talked about Fromm and the family; but the topic of poverty was reached only indirectly in the next period.

Classroom interaction

Of the three classes, the Arts class was the quietest. While Len and Roger were both quite verbal, they seemed less at ease in talking than did the most verbal students in the other classes. Conversely there were no students in this class who were completely excluded from the conversations. Discussions often died out because nobody had anything to say on a subject--a phenomenon not known in the other classes.

Substantive content

A wide variety of topics was covered by the Arts class, certainly more topics than were covered by the Mixed class and probably more than

in the Education class. Major themes were: the meaning of life, norms, and the structure of society. Compared to the other classes, the topics covered by this class were most akin to sociology as it is ordinarily understood, and I presented more theoretical material in this class than in the other two. There was little discipline in the discussions however, and often people would talk past each other.

Education Class

Teaching approach

There was more excitement in every session of this class than in any other session of the other two classes. While I was often caught up in this myself, I worried about the fact that half the class rarely said anything and that Miles and Fred particularly dominated the discussions. Periodically, I would ask some of the quieter ones what they thought about the matter, or would suggest that we ask the more verbal people to be quiet for a moment in case somebody else had something to say. I was continuously concerned that I provide opportunities for the quiet people to talk, but that I not seem to be "putting them on the spot". To some degree I shared the anxiety of the other active talkers that I did not know what the quieter people were thinking.

There were more people in this class than in the other two classes who were willing to perform leadership functions. This led me to relax more in this class about the activity itself.

I presented fewer ideas on sociological theory in this class than in the Arts class, and when I did these were tied into theories

of education. Often I had to fight to get my own ideas into the conversation, so that I probably said less in this class than in the other two classes.

Structure of course

As in the case of the Arts class, there was little programming to the course. However, on several occasions, the class as a whole undertook to see a movie, read a book or investigate some matter. By the end of the period, this class had decided to spend the remainder of the term investigating and discussing innovative schools in the Edmonton school system. To facilitate this, the class divided itself into three groups. One group which included most of the more verbal half of the class took the initiative to look at more schools than it was scheduled to do.

Classroom interaction

The atmosphere of the class was usually excited. This was most often due to the presence of Miles and Fred who were both aggressive and who held diametrically opposed positions on almost every issue. It was difficult for the quieter people to talk because of the intensity of the debate among the most verbal. When the former were asked to talk specifically, the change in atmosphere and the fact that everybody was conscious that somebody new was going to speak, made it all the more difficult for the quiet people. It was almost as if they had come into a group for the first time. However, the quiet people did not seem to be so uncomfortable about the dichotomy in the class as

were the talkative students. Often the class would break up into informal sub-groups with the discussion became particularly intense.

Substantive content

Except for the October 12 discussion on Warrendale, the November 2 discussion on prostitution, and the November 7 discussion on The Art of Loving, all discussions were ad hoc. When looked at from a distance, however, there was order in the proceedings. First, the discussions were focussed on "what is human nature?" Second, the topics often developed in response to some external event, such as the October 5 discussion on marks (which was occasioned by the need for such in the university,) the October 12 and 17 discussions on Warrendale, and the November 1 discussion on the university, (occasioned by the fact that I was giving a public talk that night on the subject.) Third, the topics which survived were those that dealt with something relevant to the people in the class: education methods, child punishment at school and at home, religion, love, sex, social service as a career, and the university. Even the subject of hippies seemed to sustain interest primarily because of Fred's personal experiences. The discussions on Warrendale and on prostitution soon turned to the more immediate concerns of spanking and free love. Further, the emphasis in the discussions was on relating personal experiences, goals and philosophies. There was a minimal amount of what could be called objective analysis, and attempts on my part to intellectualize the discussions through introducing abstract concepts, questions on theories were fruitless. Even my October 19 talk on the youth workers produced

no response, for though it was concrete, it was not immediately relevant to their lives. Many ideas for field trips were suggested, but it was only the idea of visiting innovative schools which really interested the students.

Mixed Class

Teaching approach

Unlike the other two classes, the Mixed class settled very soon on one project. This was to last for almost the whole period. I played an active role in making suggestions for the questionnaire which the class decided to issue to fraternity members. Often I felt that I was dragging the class along as we went through the rather tedious process of constructing a questionnaire. As in the case of the Arts Class, finally I felt the need to talk with the class as a whole about it's process. I was gratified that my suggestion on October 31 that we study the theory of small groups was finally rejected by the class in favour of Lyle's alternative suggestion that we study another particular group, such as the Hutterites..

Structure of course

This class undertook a two month project in studying the fraternities and then proceeded to arrange a field trip to a Hutterite colony. This involved planning to hear a speaker and to read on the subject. Rarely were there discussions on other matters during this period, although on November 23 an ad hoc discussion on universities developed.

Classroom interaction

The Mixed class had a more identifiable leadership group than did the Arts class, but the group was not as dominant as in the Education class. Discussions were often lively, but the long period of time spent drawing up a questionnaire was boring to most, and therefore the class often broke up into informal sub-groups to talk about more interesting things while others of us worked on the questionnaire.

Substantive content

The topic of fraternities was adopted at the beginning because it was interesting to some and because the others could not think of a better alternative. As the study of fraternities was completed, the class decided to study another specific group: the Hutterites. The results of the questionnaire on fraternities were uninteresting to the class, although many found the experience of issuing the questionnaires worthwhile.

Comparison of classes

Teaching approach

In all three classes often I felt that it was struggling against the direction being taken by the class as a whole. In the Arts class, I attempted to induce some sort of order in the proceedings by searching to find a topic of interest to the class as a whole, and by attempting to teach theoretical material. In the Education class, I was continually attempting to increase the number of participants in the dis-

cussion and to lead the discussion to more abstract levels. In the Mixed class, I attempted to involve the whole class in the discussion on fraternities and felt the need to continue formulating and analyzing the questionnaires, despite the fact that many people were uninterested.

During these first two months, however, I came to change much of my approach which produced this tension. I expressed more of my own feelings about the classes instead of worrying about them myself, and I became less concerned with teaching sociology as it is usually understood in undergraduate courses. The more I understood the need for the nature of the experiment to change, the more I could relate to the classes on their own terms.

Structure of course

The classes varied immensely in the structure they each established. The Mixed class had most of its activity during this period pre-planned. The Arts class had very little activity pre-planned. Except for isolated instances, the Education class only began planning ahead at the end of this period. These differences seemed to be entirely due to personalities within the group. In the Arts class there was not enough leadership to push the class as a whole toward getting organized around a project, whereas there was such leadership in the Mixed class. The leadership in the Education class expressed less concern about becoming organized, (although Miles and Ralph periodically hinted in this direction,) than did the leadership in the Mixed class.

Classroom interaction

Differences in personalities among the three groups also resulted in different class atmospheres. The education class always had very vigorous discussions, the Arts class rarely had these. The Mixed class was generally moderately vigorous in its discussions. There was little informal sub-grouping in the Arts class, but in the Education class this occurred when the discussions became particularly exciting, and in the Mixed class it occurred when the methodological discussions became particularly dull.

The Arts class showed the least amount of differentiation in terms of verbal participation in the discussions. In the Education class there was a clear dichotomy between the "talkers" and the "non-talkers". In the Mixed class there was more of a gradation from several very verbal people through to some quite quiet members of the class.

Substantive content

The focus of concern varied from the rather abstract questions being raised and considered in the Arts class to the concrete investigations of fraternities and Hutterites in the Mixed class. The Arts class was also the most undisciplined in its discussions and was least able to continue a discussion on one topic for any length of time. Again the Mixed class provided the contrast of reluctantly sticking to the task they had set themselves. In respect to both abstractness of thought and disciplined discussion, the Education class was midway between the other two classes.

While the classes varied in level of abstraction and discipline of discussion, they were similar in one respect. All classes focussed in this period on topics of immediate relevance: fraternities, education, norms of sexual conduct, and meaning of life, were the dominant themes. The only exception was the decision by the Mixed class to visit the Hutterite colony--a project which was considered in the other classes but never finally decided upon during this period.

Period 2

Arts Class

Teaching Approach

During this period of the Arts class, I was more relaxed because we now had begun to become involved in a number of projects. On the first day of this period, December 5, I suggested on the basis of what had transpired in the Mixed class that morning that the need of this class was not to talk about the meaning of life, but to experience it. This meant, for instance, going on field trips. This suggestion hit a responsive chord and the class began immediately undertaking various trips.

Also, I finally decided early in this period to change the nature of the research, and thus I was less concerned about communicating a lot of information to them. I talked as much as previously, but now in a way which was more directly related to their concerns. I now had a better idea of what these were, and I felt freer (from the constraints of the original experiment) to do so.

From the first day of this period when the class drew up a list of field trips, we were constantly aware of some future project. We listened to a tape, heard a speaker, visited a court and toured the local jail. All these events related to the common theme of criminology.

Classroom interaction

During this period there was much less talking past each other and fewer silent gaps. Again, virtually everybody in the class talked at every session.

Substantive content

The sessions mostly involved discussions on criminology and penology, although at the end of the period, several discussions at which only half the group was present, (because the other half was at the jail,) dealt with the nature of sociology.

Education Class

Teaching approach

As in the other classes, I felt more relaxed and involved during this period of the Education class than I had in the previous period. I felt less pressure to teach sociology of the nature of the experiment, and I felt that the class was working more cooperatively. During this period I felt less need to involve the quieter members of the class, because I was more satisfied that they were not unhappy with the class.

Structure of course

At the end of the last period, the Education class had decided to make a series of visits to innovative schools in the city, and this activity lasted through December. In January, there was less planning ahead than there was in the other two classes. The Education class did plan one session ahead for listening to a record of the Beatles and one session ahead for discussing the Company of Young Canadians. Near the end of the period, the class reviewed its procedure and concluded by deciding to plan ahead session by session. This plan was neglected however, after the discussion on the C Y C. Near the end of the period, the class made plans to visit a Hutterite colony.

Classroom interaction

The atmosphere during this period was less excited than it had been in the first period. During the session on the Beatles, there was occasional meditative moments. On three occasions Fred was the focus of the discussion: twice when the topic was the music of the Beatles and once when it was drugs. In one session the discussion focussed on Barbara, (one of the quieter girls), who talked about the Chinese New Year celebrations being held at that time. In no session during this period was there the kind of free-wheeling discussion, (consisting mainly of an argument between Fred and Miles,) which characterized the first period. Perhaps this was because we usually were discussing subjects on which at least one of us had some special competence: Fred on drugs and the Beatles, Barbara on the Chinese

community, myself on the C Y C and all of us on the schools we had visited.

Substantive content

A wider variety of topics was considered in this period of the Education class than was the case in the other two classes. The topics (schools, The Beatles, drugs, Chinese community, C Y C) were more concrete than in the first period, but less closely related to the lives of most members of the class. Nevertheless, they were interesting, chiefly because they were of importance to some members of the class.

Mixed Class

Teaching approach

As in the case of the other classes, I enjoyed the Mixed class more in the second period than I had in the first. There were no monotonous long-term projects such as the fraternity questionnaire, which I felt I had to lead the class through. Instead, I was able to participate with the class in a project which had more intrinsic interest: the jail system. Our discussions on this fitted with a series of three sessions on ideology and social change which I thoroughly enjoyed. I participated actively in these discussions, but in a way which was natural to me. My participation in the January 11 and January 23 sessions is a good example of the way I had intended to participate in these experimental classes. By asking one or two key questions, and making an analogy between the child's attitude toward

his teacher and the prisoner's attitude toward the jailer, I helped the discussion move to more abstract considerations. (Without the ideas of certain others such as Dale, Barry and George, however, the discussion would not have moved in this direction.)

At the first session of this period, the Mixed class decided that they should make a tour of the jail. For most of this period, the penal system was the major topic under consideration. Among the sessions in which the jail was discussed other topics were raised ad hoc.

Classroom interaction

Again in this period, the Mixed class presented more differentiation in the class in terms of verbalness than was the case in the Arts class, but less than in the case of the Education class. Barry and George were more verbal toward the end of the period when the class was discussing ideology. They were either better able or more willing to discuss their ideological beliefs. Barry in particular took an interest in these sessions. (The following summer, he inquired about the tapes of these sessions which he wanted to hear to recall some of the points which were made in the discussions.) For all students, there was much more involvement in the discussions during the period than had been the case in the first period.

Substantive content

The penal system, schools and ideologies were the topics discussed during this period. The latter discussion was the first

occasion on which this class became involved in discussing more abstract topics. This topic flowed directly from the anecdotal and hilarious January 11 session on high school teachers and dovetailed with the contemporaneous project of visiting the jails. Thus, the abstract ideas were discussed because of questions which were raised by myself and others about the concrete issues we were considering.

Comparison of the classes

Teaching approach

In all three classes during this period I was able to relax in the classes and enjoy them more. On the one hand this was because all three had either undertaken interesting projects or become involved in discussions which were involving but reasonably calm. On the other hand it was because I rejected my original conception of the experiment and focussed instead on finding what happened in a democratic class. Thus I was less concerned about "teaching sociology."

At the same time, my presence was probably more useful to the classes during this period than it was in the first period. On the basis of my special knowledge, I was able to talk more about things that interested them, (such as careers in sociology in the Arts class, community organizing in the Education class, and differences among ideologies in the Mixed class.) I was also more helpful in this period in helping each class overcome major problems. I was able to help the Arts class focus on concrete projects, (because of my experience in the Mixed class), was able to help the Education class discuss it's procedure (because of feedback to me through the

questionnaire), and was able to help intellectualize the discussions in the Mixed class (because there were people in the class who were also interested in more abstract discussions.)

Perhaps it was necessary to go through the first period of the year in order for us to get to this point, but perhaps we would have reached it sooner had I not been so concerned in the first period with leading the classes into learning matter which I considered important.

Structure of course

In all three classes there was more advanced-planning during this period than there had been in the first period. At the first session, the Arts class and the Mixed class began a study of the jail system which lasted most of the second period. The Education class had begun, in the last sessions of the first period, organizing visits to innovative schools. This project lasted the month of December. During January, two other programs were planned ahead of time in the Education class.

While in all three classes, it was necessary to break up into groups to carry out the visits which were planned, there was never any consideration given to making these divisions more permanent.

Classroom interaction

From my perspective, the quality of the interaction improved in all three classes. The Arts class became more excited, the Education class less so. The Mixed class and the Education class were less characterized by informal sub-grouping for reasons of boredom

(as had been the case in the Mixed class) or for reasons of over-excitement (as had been the case in the Education class.)

In all three classes there was a spreading out of the leadership. New people such as Barbara in the Education class and Barry in the Mixed class became much more verbal because of special competences. In the Arts class, Grant, Bob, Alexandra and Lana undertook to make arrangements of one kind or another for the class.

Substantive content

The Arts class and the Education class both became more concrete in their discussions and investigations during this period. The orientation of the Mixed class became more abstract. In all classes the intellectual quality of the discussion improved. There was more listening and talking to points made by other persons. In general, the topics considered in all classes were less immediately relevant to the lives of most of the students than had been the case with the topics considered in the first period.

Period 3

Arts class

Teaching approach

During this period the Arts class was very active in making visits, hearing speakers and seeing a movie. All but one speaker were suggested by various students, and I was involved in making the actual arrangements only three times.

At the beginning and end of this period, however, there was

the problem that we had so often experienced in the first period: how to find a topic of common interest. During these sessions, I again felt uneasy, but because of the lack of pressure associated with the original conception of the experiment, I was able to be more relaxed than I had been during the first period. I was also able to raise more questions about events which most of the class has participated in. This included field trips organized by the class and external events such as the protest march on tuition fees.

Structure of the course

For six of the thirteen sessions in this period, the activity had been planned ahead of time. These activities centered on the general topic of "social problems": jails, mental hospitals, welfare, world poverty, alienation of youth. While there was a great deal of focussed activity, in between events there was always a problem deciding what to do. The discussion on February 6 about this problem indicated that it was a matter of the personalities in the group. None of them could be described as "extroverts". They seemed to think about things to themselves but usually felt embarrassed talking about their thoughts in a large group like this. In the Mixed class and the Education class there was a sizeable proportion of the class which did not have any such inhibitions.

Classroom interaction

During the third period of the Arts class there were two types of sessions: those for which an activity was planned and those scattered among such activities. In the latter case, the interaction was usually strained as it had been during many sessions of the first period. As before, there was no clear division between "talkers" and "non-talkers", as there was in the Education class, and as to a certain extent there was in the Mixed class. Lana, Serge, Alexandera, Jack and Laine all undertook the organization of some activity for the class.

Substantive content

The content of the sessions focussed on a number of related social problems: crime, mental illness, welfare and poverty. As in the other two classes, toward the end of the period, several sessions were spent discussing the campus political situation which had become immediately relevant to students because of the tuition fee issue. This concrete issue led to discussion of wider questions of social change.

While the discussions were often slow during this period, there was less of the hopping from topic to topic without regard for previous remarks, a typical characteristic of many sessions in the first period.

Education Class

Teaching Approach

The first part of the period was spent discussing welfare, drugs, the Hutterites and the Chinese community. There were speakers present for at least part of each of the first four sessions, and beyond arranging for all but one of these, I played no special role in the class. During the middle part of the period, I played an important role in prodding the class to consider the causes of the hostility and excitement which had reappeared in the discussions. I attempted to have aired this problem which was bothering me and several others. I did not feel that the class had the time nor that I had the competence for a group sensitivity training session with all the emotional expression that involves. I did feel though that we should deal with some of the problems we faced to the extent that this was possible. In the latter part of the period, I was concerned with developing the discussions on university politics into more general considerations of social change.

Structure of the course

During the first part of this period all sessions involved some event planned in advance. In the later stages, however, the class proceeded in the spontaneous manner that had been characteristic of the first part of the year.

Classroom interaction

The style of interaction seemed to revert back to the style of the first period. Compared to the second period, there was more of the hostile bantering which had characterized many of the sessions in

the first period. After the discussions about the class's interaction in mid-February, there was no dramatic lessening of this but there seemed to be less tension arising from it. The leadership pattern remained the same as it had been in previous periods.

Substantive content

The class spent the first part of the period talking about cultures other than the one they were accustomed to: the drug "sub-culture", Hutterities and the Chinese community in Canada. At the end of the period we discussed campus politics, and from there general questions of social change.

Mixed class

Teaching approach

I did not understand my role as being any different during this period than during the second period. I continued to broaden the concrete topics being discussed to more general questions.

Structure of course

The Mixed class maintained in the third period the same degree of programming they had undertaken in the first and second periods. But whereas in the first two periods of the two they had concentrated on one or two topics, in this period they decided to study a number of topics. Thus on February 13, a list of five topics was developed as the basis for future sessions. Three of these were discussed at future sessions, but then the list was discarded. In the latter part

of this period, the class proceeded session by session without any planning ahead.

Classroom interaction

The patterns and atmosphere of interaction during this period were essentially the same as those in the second period. On February 6, we discussed the interaction in the class and the fact that some people had complained in the last set of questionnaires I had received, that some people dominated the discussion. In contrast with the tension caused by the discussion on class process in the Education class, the Mixed class discussed the problem openly. They analyzed the problem and searched for possible solutions in terms of finalizing the decision on marks and planning more activity ahead of time.

As in the latter part of the second period, the major theme during this period was social change. This theme arose in connection with university affairs, birth control, The Smug Minority, and campus politics. In addition, the discussions on alcohol and birth control lead to discussions of more formal sociological theory. As in the last period, there was during these sessions a balance between concrete referents and abstract theorizing, which I found quite satisfying.

Comparison of classes

Teaching approach

While the patterns of interaction in the Mixed class were essentially the same in this period as they had been in the second

period, in the Arts class and the Education class, there were reversions to the patterns of the first period. Because I was more familiar with the classes by this time, and because I was no longer under the pressure of teaching a certain amount of material, I was able to relax more in these circumstances. I was able to state more frankly my feelings and as a result there was more serious discussion of the problems we faced.

My role in initiating the activities was much less important in the Arts class and Mixed class than it was in the Education class. In all three classes, I felt more able to lead the discussions to abstract considerations than I had previously.

Structure of course

All three classes carried into the third period the rather high degree of advance-planning which had characterized the second period. For the Education class, this died out in mid-February. In the other two classes it ended the first week of March. By the end of the period, all three classes were talking spontaneously about campus politics generally and about the tuition fee increases in particular.

Classroom interaction

The patterns which had been evident in the second period of the Mixed class continued into the third period. In the Arts class and Education class, however, there was a reversion to the patterns of the first period. Serious discussions on the group dynamics of all three classes did not seem to have much effect on the subsequent

interaction, although the discussions did seem to lessen the tension in the classes.

Substantive content

All three classes continued discussing concrete topics in the early part of this period. As the period passed, however, and as campus politics became more interesting and immediately relevant to the students' lives, the sessions in all three classes were devoted to discussing these events. Throughout the period, the sessions generally involved what I considered to be a healthy balance between concrete studies and analytical theorizing. Major themes of the second period were continued into this third period. Thus the Arts class continued talking about social problems, the Education class about different cultures and the Mixed class about ideology and social change.

Period 4

Arts class

Teaching approach

My relationship to the class was no different during this period than it had been in the previous period.

Structure of course

There was one last planned activity during this period, but the other eight sessions (disregarding the last) were spent in ad hoc discussions. The decrease in pre-planned activity seemed to be related

to the general campus mood as final examinations approached. Perhaps too, there was less concern with keeping the group active since it would soon cease existing. On two occasions the class moved outside to enjoy the spring weather.

Classroom interaction

As in the last period, the discussions were often slow in developing around a specific topic. There seemed to be little concern about this however. A tacit agreement seemed to exist to the effect that since it was the end of the year nothing much could be done anyway. In some ways, the lack of tension about finding something to do appeared to allow the class to have more fruitful conversations when topics were finally decided on. Once on a topic there was a good deal of listening to each other and raising questions of clarification.

Substantive content

A wide variety of topics were discussed during this period: Vietnam, science, religion, rural life, fashions, civil rights and the Hutterities. These topics were developed slowly and separately in each session.

Education class

Teaching approach

There was no change in my role during this period from my role in the third period.

Structure of class

Two movies were planned ahead of time, but in the rest of the sessions the discussions developed spontaneously. The reasons for the lack of planning during this period are probably the same as those accounting for the decrease in pre-planned activity in the Arts class.

Classroom interaction

There seemed to be less excitement in the Education class during this period. People seemed to be more relaxed with each other and, as in the Arts class, there seemed to be more listening once the class developed a topic to discuss.

Substantive content

As in the Arts class, a wide variety of topics were discussed during this period. These included: science, McLuhan, drugs and hippies, cities, Summerhill, rural life, civil rights and the problems facing Indians. Most of these topics seemed to be a response to external stimuli: a television program which I discussed, a graduate student wanting subjects for an experiment, the example of the Mixed class in going downtown, a movie being shown in the Education faculty. This dependency on external events is in contrast to the method of adopting topics during the latter part of the first period. It was more like the process during the larger first part of the year.

Mixed class

Teaching approach

As in the other two classes, the Mixed class during this period found it difficult to develop topics of discussion in the various sessions. Perhaps because this was the first period in which the Mixed class operated this way I felt more uncomfortable with the class than I did with the other two classes.

Otherwise, I played the same role in the Mixed class during this period as I had in the previous period.

Structure of course

This was the first period in which the majority of sessions had not been planned ahead of time. Apart from the movies on the city which I arranged to be shown in the class, and the graduate student's experiment on media, (excluding the last) were left to spontaneous discussion. Since this condition was unusual for this class, a number of us expressed our dissatisfaction with the class's procedure during this period. This was in contrast to the other classes who were generally more relaxed about the lack of planning.

Classroom interaction

The pace was slow and there was informal sub-grouping during this period than there had been in the previous two periods. There were major changes in the roles played in the class. However, Christine, who was usually less verbal, made some major suggestions about the course during the last session I was with the class.

Substantive content

As in the other classes, there was a wide variety of topics discussed during the last period. These included: Marshal McLuhan's theories, urbanism, race relations and international politics. Generally these topics were less concrete than were the topics discussed during this period in the other two classes.

Comparison of classes

Teaching approach

There were no significant differences in any class in the role I played during this period from the role I played during the previous period. In the Mixed class, however, I shared the uneasy feeling of others in the class who were unaccustomed to this class being so unorganized.

Structure of course

In all three classes there was much less pre-planning of activities than there had been in the two previous periods. This seemed to be due to external influences such as the pressure in other courses, and perhaps even the weather. It also seemed to be related to the fact that the classes were soon to officially end which induced thinking that there was "no point starting something new".

Classroom interaction

In all three classes, topics for discussion developed slowly in the unplanned sessions. There was more informal sub-grouping in the

Mixed class than in the other two classes. Possibly this was because the Mixed class was unused to such a long series of unplanned meetings. In the Arts class and Education class there was an element of reversion to forms of interaction prevalent at the beginning of the year.

Substantive content

In all three classes, there was a wide variety of topics considered during the last period of the year. The topics in the Education class were generally concrete: those of the Mixed class were less so.

Summary

Teaching approach

During the first period, I was worried about some aspect of each of the classes. The Arts class did not seem to be able to have a discussion on one topic for more than a short part of any session. People talked past each other and were generally reluctant to express ideas. The Education class was always very excited. Up to the end of the first period, they also showed little tendency to program activity in the class. The Mixed class had set itself the task of doing a study of fraternities with questionnaires and at some points seemed only to be finishing it on principle rather than because of any interest in the project. In all classes I was concerned that the students did not seem to be responding to the mini-lectures I was periodically giving.

After this first period, I was much less worried about these problems. There are three identifiable reasons for this: a) I was now more accustomed to the classes and therefore was better able to judge what would be interesting and what would not be; b) I changed the nature of the experiment for which these classes were established, i.e. I decided to concentrate on finding what would happen in democratic classes rather than proving them more efficient for teaching sociology; c) The Arts class and Education class established projects which were to last a month, and the Mixed class developed a project which provided more lasting interest than did the fraternities.

After the first period, I was able to integrate more naturally

the abstract ideas and questions in sociology with the concrete topics which were being discussed.

Occasionally, I was able to be of help in discussing the process of the respective classes. This seemed to result from two factors: a) I had the feedback from the questionnaires, on which basis discussions of classroom interaction and structure were instigated, b) I was probably less fearful of such discussions than most others in the class and I was able to encourage analytical thinking of class problems.

Structure of course

Whereas the Mixed class began the year with highly structured programs and became less inclined to plan ahead as the year progressed, the Arts and Education classes started off without much pre-planning then began developing programs. The Arts class began planning later but lasted longer with such an approach than the Education class. During the last period of the year, (mid-March through April), there was little planning of activity in advance in any of the classes.

The differences in this regard can only be accounted for by differences in personality of the members of the group. The arts class as a whole was composed of students who were generally introverted and unsure about their own immediate future. They were least able to think in terms of adopting programs and least able to deal with the decision-making this would entail. The students in the Mixed class all had definite careers in mind, and a large proportion of them were "outward-going" personalities. They quickly thought in terms of

programs for study and quickly decided which program to adopt. The personalities of the Education class varied from the introverted and unsure to the aggressive and extroverted who had very definite reasons for entering the Education Faculty. The aggressive leaders of this class made the sessions stimulating for all, and this lessened the felt need for planning. In addition, the Education class as a whole had more difficulty making decisions than did the Mixed class.

It is interesting that in the last period, when factors such as the coming examinations, the coming termination of the classes, and perhaps the weather, worked against planning much activity, the Education class and Arts class felt more comfortable with the lack of planning than did the Mixed class. Perhaps this was a reflection of personality again, and perhaps of the fact that Mixed class had not previously experienced such a protracted period of spontaneous discussions.

While in all three classes there were field trips which required the classes to split up into groups, there was never any thought to breaking the classes into groups more permanently. It was never brought up for discussion, therefore it may just be that it never occurred to people. It may also be because there were gains to be derived from the larger group which could not be met in smaller groups.

Classroom interaction

The patterns of interaction which were manifest in the first sessions of each class were essentially continued during the year. In all cases, however, the classes developed increasingly satisfactory

patterns until the middle of the year, then began to revert back in certain respects to patterns which had obtained earlier. Thus the Arts class developed discussions more quickly, presented more ideas for the class to act on and made decisions faster during the second and third periods. The Education class was calmer and more thoughtful during the second period of the year, and the Mixed class saw less informal sub-grouping during this period.

In all classes, a large proportion of people took initiative at one time or another during the year. A review of the proceedings shows that at one time or another, all 15 people in the Arts class, 14 of the 16 in the Mixed class and 10 of the 17 in the Education class either took the initiative in introducing a topic at the beginning of a session, suggested some activity, or made a procedural suggestion. This data points up the great difference among the classes in terms of leadership structure. It also shows that the dichotomy between the dominant group and the subordinate group in the Education class persisted through the year.

There were advantages to the leadership structure of each class. The Education class was generally more exciting to all members of the class, (tense moments for myself and some others notwithstanding.) This resulted from the dominance of a few people in particular. In the Arts class, all members were involved equally because there was no clear leadership group. However, often the sessions were seen as dull. The Mixed class was intermediate in degree of excitement in the classes and amount of involvement.

In early February all three classes discussed their respective

problems: the Arts class discussed its lack of vitality, the Education class its characteristic hostile bantering, and the Mixed class the domination of the class by some members. The discussions seemed to "clear the air", but there were no significant changes in the interaction pattern after these discussions.

Substantive content

At the beginning of the year the discussions were most concrete in the Mixed class, most abstract in the Arts class. In the second period, the discussions of the Mixed class became more abstract, those of the Arts class more concrete. From the second period through to the end of the year there was in all classes what I considered to be a healthy balance between concrete references and abstract theorizing.

In all classes at the beginning of the year the discussions were for the most part immediately relevant to the lives of the students. In the second period, there was less of this in all classes, although in the Education class the topics all had great meaning to at least one member of the class. Through the remainder of the year the topics considered in all classes were less immediate than they had been in the first period.

Each class considered certain major themes through the year. For the Arts class these were on the one hand, meaning of life and personal decisions which have to be made about sex and career, and on the other hand social problems such as crime and punishment, mental illness, poverty and race relations. In the Education class the

themes were on the one hand education and on the other hand nature of man and the variety of cultures. In the Mixed class the themes were: social groups such as fraternities and Hutterites: social problems such as crime, poverty and alcohol, and ideology.

All classes considered certain topics such as the Hutterities, race relations in the United States and sex ethics. In general, a wide variety of topics was covered in each class as Appendix A shows. In all cases certain sociological principles were elicited from the topics discussed.

External events played an important role in determining which topics were to be discussed. These ranged from international events such as riots in American cities to campus events such as protest marches and fraternity rushing to personal events such as conversations the night before the class. In a sense of course, all topics came from some external source.

Conclusion

Different personalities in the three classes accounted for major differences between the classes in terms of leadership structure, mood of interaction and degree of advance-planning in the course. These personality differences also accounted for different themes in the content, and for differences in the degree of abstractness in the content.

There were also important similarities among the classes. In all three classes I became more relaxed and felt more useful after the first period. All three tended to develop a satisfactory degree

of planning by the middle of the year, but all three rejected planning in the last period. All three classes tended to develop more satisfactory forms of interaction by the middle of the year, but later on in the year reverted to some of the less satisfactory features of the pattern. The leadership structure in all three classes remained essentially constant through the year. All classes developed a satisfactory balance between concrete and abstract thinking by the middle of the year and maintained this throughout the remainder of the year. All classes covered certain similar topics and undertook similar field trips.

CHAPTER V

STUDENTS' EVALUATIONS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL CLASSES

Introduction

Questionnaires were issued to the students four times during the year. The approximate times when these were returned are the dividing points between periods of the year. Period 1 ends November 30 and includes 18 sessions. Period 2 ends January 30 and includes 11 sessions. Period 3 ends March 14 and includes 13 sessions. Period 4 ends April 18 and includes 10 sessions.

The two basic questions on the first three questionnaires were worded as follows:

1. How do you feel about the Sociology 202 course which you are taking? What have you gained from it? Where have you found it lacking?
2. What are some of the most important things you have learned in this course? Or have you learned anything at all?

A full page was left mostly blank for the answers to these two questions, and for the most part was completely filled with the answers. As it happened, the second question seemed to work more as a probe to the first, and in coding the answers little attention was paid to the location of the response.

In place of these two questions on the final questionnaire, interviews were conducted with each student during the week after classes ended. The answers to these and/or further probing questions were tape-recorded from the interviews which lasted from 15 to 45

minutes. In addition, the last question on the ritualistic final examination was one to which the answers were in large part evaluations of the classes by the students. The question read:

Moreno claims that in an experiment such as the sociology class you were in this year, each participant is carrying out his own experiment, i.e. is asking his own question and testing his own ideas about group processes. What did you learn about the possibilities for learning in a non-directive class? (Ask your own sociological question about the group, and answer it.)

For the purposes of this study, the answers to this question were combined with the comments during the oral interviews to represent the students' evaluations of the course at the end of Period 4.

On all four questionnaires, the students were also asked to state the number of classes they had missed in this and other courses. and to list what they had read relating to sociology. They were also asked to indicate whether they planned to take any future sociology courses and whether they had any thoughts about majoring in sociology. The answers to these questions, and to a special set of questions on the third questionnaire, are tabulated in Appendix B. An extra question on the second questionnaire asked the students to:

. . . please describe, as fully as possible, what has happened in this course since it began. Assume that a friend has asked you what it's all about and you want to give a very objective account of the events, the direction which the class has taken, the dynamics of the class, how decisions in specific and in general have been made, etc.

The full page answers to this question were coded in the same way as, and combined with, the answers to the two basic questions, although certain responses were unique to this question.

The final questionnaire included the extra questions which

were formulated to facilitate a comparison between the 48 students in the experimental classes and the 36 students in the traditional class who were interviewed soon after the former. These questions were designed to elicit the students' final evaluations of their respective classes and to determine the students' involvement in, attitudes toward, and gains from their first year of university. The answers to these questions are tabulated in Appendix F which specifically deals with the comparisons between the students in the experimental classes and the students in the traditional class.

Table 5:1 to 5:5 have been compiled from the response to the open-ended questions in the manner discussed in Chapter III. While the categories are derived from the data itself, they are necessarily broad in their coverage. Thus in the analysis of these tables, copious use is made of the students' own words. The comments used have been picked to give an understanding of the range of comments included in any one category, and to present some idea of the feelings which have been obliterated in the tables.

For each period of the year, (each set of questionnaires,) the responses have been analyzed class by class on the basis of the data presented in each table.

Table 5:1--Percentage of each class expressing type of general attitude toward course by period of year covered by questionnaire.

Type of attitude	Arts					Education Class					Mixed Class					All
	Questionnaire Period					Questionnaire Period					Questionnaire Period					
	1	2	3	4 ^a	said N=14 N=14 N=15 N=15 once	1	2	3	4 ^a	said N=16 N=17 N=17 N=17 once	1	2	3	4 ^a	said N=16 N=16 N=16 N=16 once	
Superlative	0	7	7	20	33	50	29	24	24	71	6	6	6	0	13	40
Very enthusiastic	29	21	33	33	53	25	24	35	41	65	50	38	38	13	87	69
Positive	29	64	40	33	80	25	29	35	24	53	13	44	38	56	94	75
Ambivalent	29	7	13	13	40	0	18	6	12	18	31	13	19	31	56	44
Negative	14	0	7	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Total	101	99	100	99		100	100	100	101		100	100	101	100		
Computed average rating ^b	2.7	3.3	3.2	3.6		4.3	3.6	3.8	3.8		3.3	3.3	3.3	2.8		

^aThe students' attitudes for the fourth period were derived from verbal responses in the interview at the end of the year.

^bThe average rating is computed by assigning each category a number from 5 (for "superlative") to 1 (for "negative").

Table 5:2--Percentage of each class referring to teaching approach by type of comment and period of questionnaire

Type of comment	Arts Class Questionnaire Period				Education Class Questionnaire Period				Mixed Class Questionnaire Period				All			
	1 2 3 4 N=14 N=14 N=15 N=15 said once				1 2 3 4 N=16 N=17 N=17 N=17 said once				1 2 3 4 N=16 N=16 N=16 N=16 said once							
Defects																
Too much freedom	21	7	7	13	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	13	25	19	
Teacher should lead more	7	7	0	40	40	0	0	6	18	24	13	6	0	31	38	
Not enough soc. learned	14	0	7	27	33	0	12	6	18	24	6	0	6	19	27	
At least one defect cited	36	14	13	67	73	0	12	12	35	41	19	6	19	38	63	
Merits																
No pressure	21	21	13	27	60	19	47	35	35	71	31	25	19	13	56	63
Can learn what one wants	7	50	7	40	73	13	41	12	53	88	44	25	0	44	69	77
At least one merit cited	29	50	20	60	87	25	59	41	65	94	56	38	19	50	87	90
Benefits																
Learned teaching method	0	7	7	7	13	25	18	6	6	41	6	6	0	0	13	23
Analysis																
Students were suspicious	7	7	0	13	20	0	0	0	12	12	6	19	6	19	31	21
Takes time to adjust	21	14	7	53	60	6	18	18	65	71	6	19	0	44	56	63
Univ. system hinders method	14	7	0	13	27	0	0	0	12	12	6	6	13	0	25	21
At least one analysis	36	21	7	73	18	6	18	18	82	88	19	44	19	50	69	79
At least one comment	64	64	27	100	100	38	77	59	100	100	75	63	44	88	100	100

Table 5:3--Percentage of each class referring to structure of course by type of comment and period of year covered by questionnaire

Type of comment	Arts Class				Education Class				Mixed				All		
	Questionnaire Period				Questionnaire Period				Questionnaire Period						
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4			
	N=14 N=14 N=15 N=15 once				N=16 N=17 N=17 N=17 once				N=16 N=16 N=16 N=16 once				said once		
Defects															
Lacks organization	29	29	27	53	73	6	24	24	29	47	13	19	38	63	60
Merits															
Students can speak out	36	14	40	33	80	19	29	29	35	71	38	19	69	44	94
Students can hear others	36	36	27	60	80	19	35	12	41	71	6	0	56	19	56
Students meet others	36	14	20	47	73	0	18	12	47	65	19	6	31	44	63
At least one merit cited	64	43	60	73	93	31	65	41	71	100	50	19	88	69	100
Benefits															
Made friends	0	7	7	7	13	0	12	0	12	24	31	0	6	19	38
Analysis															
Organization improved	0	21	0	20	40	0	6	0	0	6	0	6	0	0	6
At least one comment	86	64	80	80	100	38	77	65	82	100	56	31	100	100	100

Table 5:4--Percentage of each class referring to classroom interaction by type of comment and period of year covered by questionnaire.

Type of comment	Arts Class					Education Class					Mixed					All
	Questionnaire Period					Questionnaire Period					Questionnaire Period					
	1	2	3	4	said once	1	2	3	4	said once	1	2	3	4	said once	
	N=14 N=14 N=15 N=15 N=15					N=16 N=17 N=17 N=17					N=16 N=16 N=16 N=16					
Defects																
Too few participate	21	0	7	0	20	38	35	6	6	47	0	25	6	6	31	33
Some dominate class	7	0	0	0	7	0	67	6	18	18	0	19	13	6	31	19
Lacks vitality	14	7	0	40	47	0	0	0	18	18	0	6	6	13	19	27
Too much hostility, tension	0	0	0	0	0	13	12	0	35	41	0	6	0	6	13	90
At least one defect cited	29	7	7	40	53	50	35	12	59	77	0	38	19	25	69	67
Merits																
Discussions exciting	7	7	13	0	13	25	24	24	6	53	6	13	25	0	31	33
Discussions motivating	0	21	7	40	47	6	18	6	47	43	25	19	0	19	44	50
At least one merit cited	7	29	13	40	53	31	35	29	47	88	25	31	25	19	56	67
Benefits																
Learned to talk in groups	29	0	20	27	53	19	6	12	6	41	38	19	38	13	50	48
Learned to listen to others	36	0	0	0	27	0	0	12	12	18	13	6	19	0	31	25
Gained group sensitivity	21	0	13	60	73	25	24	29	35	76	19	25	6	81	88	80
At least one benefit cited	57	0	33	73	100	31	24	47	53	82	44	44	44	88	94	92
Analysis																
Decisions difficult to make	0	36	7	7	40	0	12	0	0	12	0	0	0	6	6	19
Informal leadership existed	0	0	7	33	40	13	35	0	53	76	0	38	13	69	75	65
No informal leadership	0	21	0	33	53	6	18	0	6	29	0	0	0	6	6	29
At least one analysis	0	43	13	53	93	19	53	0	59	82	0	38	13	69	75	83
At least one comment	72	57	53	100	100	77	82	53	82	100	63	81	56	100	100	100

Table 5:5--Percentage of each class referring to substantive content. of course by type of comment and period of year covered by questionnaire.

Type of comment	Arts Class					Education Class					Mixed Class					All
	Questionnaire Period					Questionnaire Period					Questionnaire Period					
	1	2	3	4	said N=14 N=14 N=15 N=15 once	1	2	3	4	said N=16 N=17 N=17 N=17 once	1	2	3	4	said N=16 N=16 N=16 N=16 once	
Defects																
Discussions unintellectual	14	7	0	13	33	31	29	18	29	65	19	13	13	44	56	52
Discussions boring at times	36	21	7	13	47	0	12	12	12	35	13	25	13	13	50	44
No conclusions reached	7	7	13	21	40	6	6	0	6	18	0	6	0	0	6	21
At least one defect cited	57	36	20	27	67	38	41	29	47	82	31	44	25	50	88	79
Merits																
Topics practical, relevant	0	7	13	0	20	13	6	12	29	41	0	6	13	6	13	25
Topics interesting	21	64	33	100	100	6	41	18	88	94	19	50	38	81	100	98
Learn more, retain more	7	21	13	67	67	13	18	12	53	65	25	31	13	38	75	69
At least one merit cited	29	63	47	100	100	31	65	35	100	100	38	75	44	94	100	100
Benefits																
Learned how to think	7	7	27	0	40	13	12	18	6	24	19	0	0	0	19	27
Philosophy developed	29	14	13	7	40	19	29	0	6	41	19	19	19	25	44	42
Learned others' opinions	72	36	40	60	87	81	53	41	24	100	13	31	50	31	56	81
Learned facts, insight	14	86	60	60	93	38	65	59	53	100	81	88	63	50	100	98
Became involved in life	0	0	27	27	47	0	0	12	24	29	6	13	19	6	25	33
Learned sociology concepts	50	21	13	27	67	0	18	12	24	35	75	38	19	13	75	58
Learned, but can't say what	0	0	13	0	13	19	25	12	6	29	13	0	19	6	25	27
At least one benefit cited	93	93	80	80	100	94	100	88	77	100	100	88	94	75	100	100
Analysis																
No conclusions reached	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	0	0	41	0	6	0	0	6	17
Suggest topics, field trips	7	7	0	53	67	0	29	0	71	71	19	13	6	81	81	73
At least one analysis	7	7	0	53	67	0	59	0	71	82	19	19	6	81	81	77
At least one comment	100	100	87	100	100	94	100	100	100	100	100	94	100	100	100	100

Analysis of the Students' Evaluations

Period 1

Arts Class

General attitude

The first period of the Arts class was mostly spent getting used to the new type of structure. There was more dissatisfaction in the Arts class than in the other two classes. Laine and June were the only two students of all three classes who were unequivocally negative in their evaluating of the course.

I do not feel that we are accomplishing much in this course. Because we have no textbooks or exams we are not really learning anything. (Laine)

At first I thought the course would become very interesting but I now find it very dull and boring. (June)

The computed average rating of the class was lower in this class than in the other two classes.

Teaching approach

The only comments suggesting that the approach involved too much freedom came from three members of the Arts class. While one of these three, Laine, was convinced that there was too much freedom, Tom and Grant were ambivalent.

The course is good in that it offers a greater freedom than most others. The idea is that, upon becoming interested in some field, we will go out and seek information instead of having it pushed to us. Some people feel lost after 12 years of being pushed into learning. Some

take advantage of their new freedom. Some seek out knowledge. In theory if we are inquisitive enough, we will learn a great deal, BUT being loaded down with other courses kills this desire for learning, because we do not have to study this course. This course is wonderful for people who have the time for it, or for the more mature, who make the time for it. (Tom)

I think it's a great idea for one course . . . There is no guarantee that everyone will learn (not being forced) and in the university presently, this is not the way it is. I think everyone should have a chance or trial offer and if they want they can continue outside the university because I don't think it can exist successfully in a forced learning institution. The university is busy forcing you to learn so you don't have time to learn some things you want to. (Grant)

(It is perhaps significant that the only boys of the Arts Class to return for a second year of the experimental course were Tom and Grant.)

In addition, Serge and Roger, without being critical themselves, suggested that it would take time for the class to get used to the teaching approach.

Because it is a relatively different idea it is hard, at times, to be completely accepted. (Serge)

It is a new and fairly different approach to education and I feel the whole class will have to adjust to it. (Roger)

Fewer people saw merits in the approach than saw defects in it, the only one of the three classes in which this was so. Tom saw a merit in that one could learn what one wanted, (quoted above). He was the only one in his class to note this feature of the approach. Geraldine, Dan and Sarah found merit in the lack of pressure associated with the approach.

Structure of course

More members of the Arts class than of the other classes were critical of the lack of organization in the course. Criticisms of the lack of organization were couched in some way that indicated responsibility on the part of the class as a whole.

I have found the course to be lacking in direction. There does not seem to be any purpose or goal towards which we are guiding our efforts. (Len)

--lack of organization; while this may seem to be reverting back to an inferior system, there must be a limited amount of organization. This in no way reflects on the competence of the discussion leader, but rather on the reluctance of some to become involved. (Serge)

We do not pursue a topic to an extent where we will obtain some value from the discussion. (June)

If we could really pursue some topic and find out as much as we could about it, the period would be worthwhile. (Laine)

On the other hand, more in the Arts class than in the other two classes saw merit in the structure in as much as it was a small group which allowed one to interact with others. Two-thirds of the students saw this aspect of the course as important to them. The following is a sample of these comments:

It is very interesting to find out the ideas and values of our peers and how they react to world problems. (June)

I like to voice my opinion and argue with other people concerning theirs . . . This class gives everyone a chance to defend what they believe in, something sadly lacking in all my other courses. (Sarah)

I would like to say that it is a refreshing course, in that, we can express our opinions and frustrations to a group our own age. (Roger)

I like something where I can get to know people in a group of sixteen and also I can express what I feel and think rather than have a dull professor stand and lecture for a period. You may as well have a tape machine for the 150-200 people in the class. (Grant)

I'm glad to have an opportunity wherein there is student and prof contact. (Lana)

When I first walked into my Sociology class and discovered what it was to be like--no books, test, etc., I thought "Oh, no!" We were just going to sit around and talk. Horrors. I have never been one for talking in class or expressing my opinion and I thought I would just detest this particular class. But gradually my opinion has begun to change. I still don't talk much, but I enjoy listening to other students and perhaps by the end of the year I will have learned how to express myself and my opinions. (Jean)

Classroom interaction

The Arts class was more worried about classroom interaction than the Mixed class, but less worried than the Education class. Most of the defects seen in the interaction were regarding the lack of participation by all members of the class.

Most comments regarding the interaction, however, had to do with the benefits people saw themselves deriving from the class. More of the Arts class than of the two classes saw themselves benefitting in this way. Most of the benefits cited had to do with learning to listen to others. The following is a sample of the ways in which people saw themselves benefitting from the interaction itself.

Most important I think is that we are learning to carry an intelligent discussions . . . (Jean)

I think I have learned how to better understand the views and beliefs of others. (Roger)

Apart from the odd basic sociological and psychological theories we've been exposed to, the most important thing I've learned is to listen and appreciate the opinions of the others . . . (Geraldine)

One of the most important things I have learned is to "keep my cool" when someone voices an opinion radically different from mine. It bothers me immensely to hear someone state things I feel are utter garbage. Now though, I think I can gain something from someone else's opinion and become more broadminded. (Sarah)

I have learned to talk within a group confidently and listen to the opinions of others. (Dan)

Substantive Content

More than in any of the other classes, students in the Arts class found the discussions sometimes boring or irrelevant. In addition to the five who made this comment, two said that the discussions were lacking intellectually, and one complained about the lack of conclusions in the discussions.

Sometimes I have found that the discussion does tend to become boring or else I cannot see any relation of it to the sociology course or my idea of what sociology is. (Roger)

I think it is a great idea for one course, but it tends to turn into a philosophy or psychology discussion. (Grant)

I think we lack organized discussion. I don't think we should be required to follow a set sequence of points, but we too often wander off on 'tangents' completely unrelated to the original topic. (Geraldine)

. . . have not arrived at any worthwhile conclusions--other than that whatever we decide isn't important anyway. (Jean)

Most of the substantive benefits listed revolved around the

fact that the person benefitting was becoming aware of others' opinions.

The following are typical comments of this kind.

I have learned almost nothing concrete in this course except the opinions of others. (Jack)

Everyone is different, but nearly everyone has problems or thinks along the same lines of problems as I.

Many people are idealistic and this is what changes society, but many are too idealistic. (Grant)

--gained a knowledge of how other university students feel about society as a whole, and people and ideas specifically. (Serge)

Half the class indicated that they had learned some sociological concepts or theories. Where these were mentioned specifically they were either Fromm's concept of love (mentioned by three people), the distinction between mores and folkways, (two people), or Merton's anomie paradigm (one person). Four people said that in some way they had changed as a person or else that their philosophy had changed.

I also think I've learned a little bit more about growing up. (Roger)

I've learned with a startling awareness that I couldn't possibly be an atheist. (Lana)

I have gained some insights into the opinions and beliefs of other students, as well as a better understanding of my own opinions and beliefs. (Jack)

The acquisition of a new point of view regarding university and life generally is what I think I have acquired. The existentialist dilemma. The damn uselessness (from a practical viewpoint) of many courses. The whole merry-go-round of the university is so irrelevant to what we are preparing ourselves for except that the society places a premium on B.A. M.A. and PhD. BS (not BSc) would perhaps be more appropriate. (Tom)

Conclusion

In general the evaluations reflect the fact that the Arts students were wrestling with this new approach to teaching, and that what they benefitted from the course during this period was related to the experience of the class itself, rather than what the class allowed them to do. They were the most critical of the teaching method, yet most frequently cited merits and benefits related to the new experience. None of them were as extroverted as some of the students in the other two classes. Only a couple had a fixed vocational goal in mind, and some were not even sure why they were in University. For both reasons, it seems, they found it much more difficult than the other two classes to organize themselves. Perhaps, as we concluded near the end of this period, the class felt guilty that it did not get organized. The fact that it could not do so during this period, perhaps accounted for the generally less favourable feelings toward the course despite the fact that all seemed to have benefitted in some way.

Education Class

General attitude

The Education class was very enthusiastic about the course. In one way or another, eight people said that it was the best course they were taking. None were even ambivalent about the course. The following are examples of some of the most enthusiastic judgements.

I find my Sociology 202 course to be the most enjoyable of my courses this year. It is the only practical course which I am taking this

year and without it I would become very frustrated and probably crack up. (Ralph)

This Sociology course is an example of what I think University courses should be like. (Eleanore)

Particular sociology course is one of the most enjoyable I have ever encountered. (Laura)

Teaching approach

Unlike the other two classes, the Education class had no students who criticized the teaching method on the first questionnaire. On the other hand, the fewest number of specific merits about the teaching method were cited by this class. Four people, however, volunteered that they had learned about the teaching method themselves, which as future teachers, was important to them.

I think I have learned something since I am going into education, it is important that I find or at least search for a way in which education can be presented in the future. (Eleanore)

From this course alone I'm convinced that people are capable of learning more from this sort of discussion than by any other means . . . I learned that a class like this can be fun. (Jane)

Structure of course

As in the case of teaching method, fewer people had comments to make about the structure of the course than in the other classes. Only one person, Miles, complained about the lack of organization. All other comments were in praise of the fact that students could speak out and could listen to others in a small group like this..

It's really good to get to know how other people feel on touchy subjects. (Carol)

It also gives me a greater opportunity to view other peoples' opinions and relate them to my own. (Fred)

Classroom interaction

Half this class cited defects in the interaction, compared to less than a third in the Arts class and none in the Mixed class. While Carol and Hana complained about the tension and hostility in the class, six complained that not all were participating in the discussions. On the other hand, more in this class than in the other classes, saw the classroom atmosphere as exciting.

. . . offers more than adequate opportunity for mental stimulation and invigoration . . . Because of the divergence of opinions presented within the class and the usual fervour of the participants, there is rarely a reason for the mental stagnation which so often pervades the usual classroom situation; indeed within the particular situation, such an opportunity could only be present if the members were mental zombies. (Laura)

I agree that the absence of exams and texts does relieve the all-too-frequent boredom in these classes. (Miles)

Carol and Hana implied that informal leadership existed in the class, but Laura implied the contrary. No one in the other classes made any reference to leadership at all.

Substantive content

More in this class than in the other classes criticized the course for the lack of intellectualism in the discussions. The following comments are typical in this regard.

I do not believe that I have learned a great deal in the objective sense. I say this because most of our arguments (including my own) are based on emotion and so-called "common knowledge" rather than hard objective facts . . . There is little common agreement on which topics to study and once a topic has been chosen and presented there is remarkably little constructive, realistic criticism . . . Perhaps I am at fault here but I find very little of the realistic approach to the solution of some of the topics discussed. The solutions are on the Platonic level. (Miles)

I resent when we decide to read a book and not everyone reads it but they still express their opinions on it although they have not read it and therefore cannot have a true opinion on it. But this is no fault of the seminar and is only the fault of individuals. (Sam)

We seem to be discussing too much what kids of our age interested in and not going into further fields. (Gord)

The merits of the course in regard to content were seen by Ralph and Laura in terms of the "practicality" of the discussions, Barbara said that the topics were important, while two others said that the learning is better in this kind of an environment. All but three people said that they had benefitted from hearing others' opinions. The following comments are typical.

I find I have developed a wider view on a lot of matters which before I either had a narrow opinion of or had no opinion at all. (Alice)

I've become more aware of the opinions of other people . . . There is an extremely great deviance in opinions even within a small group. (Sean)

You see that there are many different points of view on a certain topic that you may not know even existed, and that what you think may be inferior in certain respects to what others think of the matter.

I have gained an insight into other peoples' ideas and their methods of reasoning. (Gord)

Subjectively I have learned alot about other person's ideas on various controversial topics . . . Subjectively I have learned something which is important to me. People of my age seem to have the same problems and goals in mind even though their methods of attainment may differ radically from mine. (Miles)

Thirty-eight percent of the students in the Education class said that they had learned some facts or insights from the discussions. The specific subjects mentioned were: experimental schools, hippies and community development. Nobody in this class mentioned anything which could be construed as orthodox sociology. Three people stated that they had learned something, but could not say just what.

I have learned, I know I have! Because so often I'll be reading something and some things which have been taught in class come back to me, and I seem to understand my material. Yet for me to say I've learned this, and this, and this . . . it's just impossible. (Alice)

I haven't learned anything at all. But yet I have learned lots. It's hard to put into words what I have learned. (Marilyn)

This is a hard question to answer what have you learned and I have run up against it before. My mother used to ask me this every day when I came home from school. I found it difficult to answer her. (Sam)

Conclusion

Discussions in the Education class were always vigorous and apparently exciting. However, there was a polarization in the class between the talkers and the non-talkers, and this rift was apparently the greatest source of anxiety in the class. The quiet people must have internalized the norms of the talkers, for while two-fifths of the

people complained about the lack of participation, nobody complained that some people were talking too much. As was the case with the Arts class, the greatest gain from the course seemed to be in the broadening of oneself by hearing new ideas. While the discussions were exciting and produced enthusiastic evaluations of the course, there was concern that they were intellectually lacking.

Mixed class

General attitude

The Mixed class was moderate in its feelings about the class. More students in this class than in the other two classes had ambivalent or non-committal feelings about the course. The following quotations are from two of the five in this category.

I don't think it is possible yet to tell how I feel about this sociology course. (Margaret)

It is an easy course to pass. It is a course in which one must exercise self-discipline if one wishes to learn anything. (Barry)

Teaching approach

More students in this class than in the other two classes saw merit in the teaching approach. More students saw the lack of pressure as a merit, and many more saw the fact that one could learn what one wanted in the class as a merit. The following quotations are typical of the latter type of comment.

I have never been in such a class; I mean by this that we the class regulate the course on what we think the course should be. I can't think of a better way to teach the course. (Dean)

The method used in my class creates more interest and class participation than normal for we are making a study of sociological groups we want to study and are interested in, and not because we're told to. (Reg)

I like the idea of doing what interests us and having to read only that which we are interested in. (Kate)

. . . it is a better course in that it has no restrictions on study so since it is up to us to choose our subject we may as well choose something interesting to discuss. Because it is interesting we take some trouble to learn about it, whereas if it was a boring subject that had to be learned one would just learn what had to be learned to pass. (Barry)

More defects in the teaching method were cited in this class than in the Education class, but fewer than in the Arts class. Two people felt that the teacher should lead more, but none suggested that there was too much freedom in the class.

Structure of course

Fewer in this class than in the other two classes mentioned as a merit of the course the fact that one could hear others' ideas in the class. Yet more students in this class said that they appreciated the fact that they could speak out in class. The following comments are typical.

It is different from any other class in that freedom is unlimited. (By freedom, I mean mainly that of thought.) Everyone's ideas are considered which goes against all principles of educational convention. (Dale)

From this course I have learned how to debate. This is the only course in which the students are able to express their opinion. I feel that this is a very important asset to a person. (Jill)

In a small group such as ours, each individual should, and I think does, feel freer and more confident when he speaks. (Margaret)

Many more students in the Mixed class than in the other classes indicated that they had benefitted from the class by making friends.

Classroom interaction

In contrast to the other two classes, none in the Mixed class complained about the classroom interaction. Four people commended the interaction for motivating them. The following comment is typical.

I learned that you don't have to do work for marks always but that the way the course is set up in our class it is interesting enough to make me come to learn for the sake of learning and not just for getting marks and getting on the good side of the teacher. (Vivian)

More in this class than in the others said that as a result of this class their ability or confidence to speak in groups had increased.

Substantive content

Fewer students in the Mixed class than in other two classes mentioned defects in the content of the course. Three of the quietest girls felt that the discussions lacked intellectually. Two boys found the discussions sometimes boring. The following comments are representative expressions of discontent.

I feel we didn't get as much from the Hutterite colony that we should have. We should have spent more time before we went in reading more about them. Sure, I think it was fun and I saw a different way of life than I am used to, but

I knew if I had had more time before I went, that I could have read something about them and been more prepared for what I saw. (Jeanne)

I sometimes feel the class is a waste of time. Tuesday, for example, instead of laughing about what we saw at the Hutterite colony, I feel we should have discussed it seriously. In the almost two months we have been "discussing" fraternities I still don't know all that much about them--like why people join such things. I think if we set ourselves a goal to reach, that we could accomplish a lot more. (Kate)

The only complaints are those of boredom mainly in respect to discussing frats. Enough is enough. I think that this is probably my own small attention span. (Dale)

More members of this class than of the other two classes cited merits in the content of the course. In particular, more said they had learned more in this course than in others, or that what they did learn would be retained longer. Kate and Dean express this point most strongly.

I think I have learned more from this course than any other I am taking. I didn't really learn why people join fraternities but I have a much better idea of their value because of talks I had with the actives. The Hutterites interested me greatly and I plan to follow up by reading more about them. The visit was just great. (Kate)

By advising us and then letting us discuss the problems, I find that I can understand and learn much better. (Dean)

More students in this class than in the other two classes stated that they had learned how to think. The following comments from Reg and Margaret indicate that this was one of the benefits of the course to them.

The reasons people joined groups, and the logic behind their motivations to remain in the group

were entirely different to any that I had imagined. This opened up my eyes to the fact that the motivations and interactions of a group are not black or white, cut and dried; but that they are almost infinite and interlacking. I'm learning not to make conclusions until I have studied, in fair detail, the group for I'm usually wrong. (Reg)

I have learned many sociological terms and methods of inquiry. I even believe I am now questioning things in society with greater depth and interest than before. It seems to me, there is more in social problems and groups than what meets the eye. And before you reach any conclusions or opinions you should go directly to the source of the problem or question and find out for yourself, first hand. As far as anything more concrete, I can't really say, that I've learned anything more. (Margaret)

The most striking feature about the data for the Mixed class is that it had many fewer people who said that they had learned others' opinions, but many more people who said that they had learned facts or insight about society. The latter type of comment was in reference to what had been learned about fraternities and/or Hutterites. Three-quarters of this class referred to some sociological concepts which they had learned, (usually methodological) as opposed to half the Arts class and none in the Education class. Two people said that they had learned something but that it was hard to say exactly what.

Three people in this class, more than in the others, suggested ideas for future activity on the questionnaire forms.

One form which I would like to see is more written work; not that talking isn't sufficient but if one Saturday we had had to write a short essay of what we learned, I think it would have been more concrete for us and we could have added as we discussed later. (Margaret)

I think if we made a move to study more sociological problems such as slums, mental health and

welfare work. (Godfrey)

I think we should now dig deeper into groups of people--like the Hutterites--and go into detail about other groups, so that we can compare. As of now we have started but let's not stop now. (Christine)

Conclusions

The Mixed class had organized itself to study one topic by the second session of the first period. As this project on fraternities was being finished in early November, the class immediately shifted its attention to Hutterites. This concentration on clearly defined topics of study explains the fact that in marked contrast to the other classes, this class said that they had learned some facts or insight about society, while only 13% said that they had learned from others expressing their ideas or opinions. This early organization probably also explains why this class was generally more happy with the content of the course than were the other two classes. The students in this class were glad of the opportunity to express themselves, yet in contrast to the other classes, were not as aware of the benefits to be derived from listening to others--a fact consistent with what they felt they had learned substantively. There were more extroverted personalities in this class than in the other two--mainly those students in physical education--and this explains the value they placed on gregariousness. As students in "professional" faculties, they were more appreciative than others of the opportunity to study what they wanted and to talk when they wanted in this class.

Period 2

Arts class

General attitude

The class was more happy with the course during this period.

There were no negative comments, and Tom had the only ambivalent feelings about the course.

It's a soft touch and it will never work--under the present system. If it was my major, PERHAPS I would read on my own. As was said at the Arts Seminar: we're a bunch of lazy slob. We live only for examinations . . . We went on our first field trip not long ago which proved extremely interesting, and provided a topic of conversation about which we were all at least somewhat knowledgeable. The class has no leader. We just talk; someone might talk all period one day, then never again for a long time. It's also depressing because we get down to some pretty basic questions such as why we are here. Of course, nobody knows and then we wonder why we are beating our brains out for a stupid degree. I almost dread coming some times.

Grant, the other person who had ambivalent feelings last time now felt this was his best course, but mainly because the other courses were so boring. June, who last time expressed thoroughly negative feelings about the course was very enthusiastic in her comments on the second questionnaire.

At first the greatest importance this class had for me was the fact that we did not have any books or assignments. Nothing was demanded of me, in turn I did nothing. During our discussions I learned a few things about society etc. To me the course seemed extremely disorganized and boring. Since the class had decided to do something about the situation we have become more of a group using facts and not illusions as the basis of our discussions and arguments. We now decide where we want to go on

field trips and organize it ourselves. I now find the course worthwhile and stimulating.

June's friend, Laine, who also had completely negative feelings about the course last time was less enthusiastic now, but positive in her evaluation.

I am beginning to enjoy it more than I did previously. This is because we have finally organized our group and are doing something.

Teaching approach

As in the Mixed class, but contrary to the Education class, there were fewer defects cited in the teaching approach this time. Sarah still felt that I should provide more leadership.

At times, it takes awhile to arrive at decisions, because of the variety of opinions. It is then, that I think the prof should step in and make the decision.

Tom still felt that "it will never work".

Almost twice as many people cited merits in the approach. In particular, seven people this time as opposed to one last time stated as a merit that one could learn what one wanted in this course. The following comments are typical.

The only pressure comes from within. We are as free to do as we choose and what we deem the most interesting and valuable. (Roger)

I like the Sociology 202 course because of the freedom it involves. (Bob)

Knowledge is not being forced on students, but interest is generated beforehand and anyone wishing to pursue these interests may do so without feeling a pressure to do so. (Jack)

Basically, the absolute freedom of class discussion topics is good, because the spontaneity leads to very interesting talks. (Geraldine)

Fewer people still noted, however, that it is difficult to adjust to this kind of class.

Structure of course

Four people still complained about the lack of organization in the course. Their following comments explain why.

It usually works out . . . that things that really interest the class start getting tossed around just before the bell rings, and by the next class, the topic has been forgotten. Perhaps we could tape our classes and play back the exciting parts to recreate the motions and give ourselves a place to start.

It seems most decisions we make are in confusion. (Jack)

The course seems to lack a direction. (Bob)

This course is lacking in even a rough semblance of curriculum. If there was some form of program in this course it would remove a lot of wasted time. (Jack)

As in the other classes, fewer people this time noted benefits of meeting in a small group. Still, six people did feel that the point was worth making. Here are a few of their comments.

I enjoy the atmosphere in the course. Now that we all know each other, it's really easy to express ideas and opinions. (Sarah)

On the whole our class is quite great. It's nice to know all the members of your class--I think that we have developed a feeling of oneness. (Lana)

I still feel the class is extremely interesting because everyone is so different, particularly in religious convictions. (Grant)

Three people noted that the class was getting more organized.

Classroom interaction

Only one student in this class mentioned a defect in the participation. This is in marked contrast to the other two classes, and a decrease from four people mentioning such defects, on the first questionnaire. Grant found the class "at times a little boring".

As in the other two classes, more people cited merits to the interaction this time. The increase was greatest in the Arts class. One person found the discussions exciting, three others found them motivating. The following comments are typical.

We get into some really good discussions sometimes. There sure are a lot of different viewpoints among us--this creates interest and incentive. (Lana)

Knowledge is not being forced on students, but interest is generated beforehand. (Jack)

Whereas in the first period more Arts students than students in the other two classes stated that they had benefitted from the classroom interaction, none said so this time. In the other two classes about the same number made this claim.

Five people noted that decisions were difficult to make in the class, and three referred to the fact that there was no informal leadership in the class. This was the only class in which no people claimed such leadership existed.

Substantive content

The Arts class was unique in that fewer students cited defects in the content than had been the case last time. Also, fewer students cited defects this time than in the other two classes. As before, the major complaint was that the discussions sometimes became boring or un-

interesting. Roger's comment is typical. .

The only thing I find lacking is in us as students. We have not made the course as interesting as it could have been. But now that we are becoming adapted to it who knows?

On the other hand, there was a great jump in the number of people who said that they found topics or field trips interesting. Nine people, more than in either of the other classes said this. The primary feeling behind these comments was that the field-trips and discussions are more "real" than lectures. There was less praise of the actual topics themselves.

Fort Saskatchewan was really interesting, and I feel it show's what's really right and wrong with prisons--more than could be gained from a book. (Grant)

I feel I have gained experience from this course more than I would have from books in the regular Sociology 202 first year. The class seems to see and discuss the problems of our society as they are and not just from another group's viewpoint. (Alexandra)

I enjoy the seminars much better than if it were a professor textbook lecture type of thing. (Sarah)

. . . the spontaneity leads to very interesting talks. (Geraldine)

Along the same lines, three people said explicitly that they learn at least as much through this teaching approach. Geraldine's comment is typical.

I think we can learn what we must learn of sociology through discussion and experience. It's the best way.

All but two students stated this time that they had learned some facts or insight as a result of the class. This is in marked contrast to the two who said that they had learned something of this

nature last time. The jail and general insight into people's behaviour were most frequently mentioned. Only half as many people stated that they had learned from hearing other people's opinions and two of the comments which were made had to do with the kind of reasoning other people employ.

During our discussions I learned how some people are quite blind to facts and reality itself.
Some people without enough facts go to extremes. (June)

. . . have learned how different two opinions may be, and how hard to convince (close-minded) a person with a sincere dogma. (Grant)

Only half as many this time state that they had learned something about themselves or that their philosophy had developed. Whereas on the first questionnaire, more people in the Arts class than in the other two classes stated this, fewer people did this time.

In the second period, the Arts class developed a program of activity. This development was reflected in the answers to the questionnaire. People were generally happier with the course, saw more value in the teaching approach and fewer defects in it. Four people still found the course lacking organization, but three now said that organization had improved. Fewer defects and more merits were seen in the classroom interaction. Similarly, fewer people than last time cited defects in the content of the course, and more people cited merits. Many more people stated that they had learned facts or insight from the course and many fewer said that they had learned from other people's opinions, had developed their own philosophy further, or had learned sociological concepts.

Education class

General attitude

The Education class lost in this period some of its initial enthusiasm. Three people, all among the most verbal, were now ambivalent in their feelings about the course.. Here are their comments.

I feel that while the idea behind the running of the course is feasible there are a few things which are not quite so realistic . . . I am no longer quite sure if I am learning from it or not. (Miles)

Although the novelty of the course sparked much interest and enthusiasm, it is unfortunate that my own participation has not been as wholehearted or spontaneous as was probably desired. (Laura)

I feel in a way guilty about the course because I have been taught that unless one memorizes and can quote direct facts or make use of the scientific method, one has not learned . . . But on the whole I have become quite defensive when the course has been criticized as being useless. (Gord)

However five people, four of whom were among the quietest people in the course, still said one way or another than sociology was their best course.

Sociology is my favorite course. (Sam)

I find the present Sociology course exactly as I thought university should be. I feel that I have learned more in this course than in any other. (Hana)

It's a great course the way it is now. All courses should be like this. (Barbara)

I think it is an ideal course. (Dave)

I like the Sociology 202 course better than any of my other classes. (Marilyn)

Teaching approach

As compared with no defects in the teaching approach being listed in the last questionnaire, this time two people found that not enough sociology was being learned. On the other hand, more people in this class than in the other classes listed merits of the teaching approach. Ten people mentioned this kind of merit on the second questionnaire as opposed to four on the first questionnaire. There was approximately the same number of people who liked the course because it involved no pressure as liked the course because one was free to study what one wanted. Three people stated that as a result of participating in this class they had learned about education.

In my opinion, the history of this class deserves a niche in the field of education. Too often the class proves the adage about freedom being ill-used through ignorance . . . (Laura)

I have learned a lot about education which is more than I can say about education courses. (Too bad every faculty couldn't have let 1st year students meet in small groups to discuss and really learn.) (Gord)

I have learned what education and knowledge really is. (Eleanore)

Structure of course

At the end of the second period, four people stated that they found the course lacking in organization. This was an increase by three people over the first questionnaire. But this time six more people cited merits to the structure of the course in terms of its being a small group. Many more people cited merits to the structure in this class than in the other classes. The following are typical comments.

People are less afraid to speak out what is on their minds. (Sam)

Although the lack of a guiding structure sometimes results in mass chaos, it does permit each participating member to expound his views and/or opinions on any subject without fear of being reprimanded for "going-off-track".

Religion, love and other sociological problems have been dealt with in a manner whereby each person had the chance to express his view on a certain topic. (Derek)

In this course you really get to know how different people think. (Carol)

It's really good that we can give our own opinion about things. I don't say very much in class, but it's just as interesting to listen to the ideas of others. (Dave)

Classroom interaction

As in the first period, the greatest concern during this period of the Education class seemed to be that not everyone participated in the discussions. The same number of people said this as before. The following comments give some ideas of the feelings involved.

Few of the class venture to given an opinion although at times one of them will startle everyone by debasing him or herself to the point of speech. (Miles)

. . . it is unfortunate that my own participation has not been as wholehearted or spontaneous as was probably desired. Lack of participation could be accounted for by a somewhat vague feeling of unease about the reactions of others; if those around the class could/would give fuller vent to their opinions, there might be no need to be so defensive and one-sided when expressing views. (Laura)

Two people complained about the degree of hostility in the class discussions.

Much of the subject matter is more trivia yet we fight for our stand as though our safety was endangered by the loss of our stand. (Miles)

What is the use of any discussion if it turns into a full-fledged battle within ten minutes? Perhaps more emphasis should be placed on leaving one's opinion open to extension and further development, rather than adopting a fighting stance and a "do-or-die" attitude. We're all human--and all of us have the same chance of making errors. (Laura)

The only negative comment about the domination of the class by some was made by Carol, fairly verbal herself.

If you have the courage to state your opinion against some of the leaders of the group it will be taken into consideration.

However six people said in a less evaluative way that informal leadership existed. Here are some of the comments. Of the six, Alice was the only person in the less verbal group.

The group is pretty well run, or should I say monopolized, by 5 of us. We do the biting, fighting and scratching. (Miles)

Informal leaders arise to make decisions and keep everyone on their toes. (Fred)

At the beginning those who would lead the speaking and those who would form the listening part of the group were established. (Ralph)

The class consists of a few leaders, usually in opposition to one another, and those who follow or oppose these few. (Alice)

As was the case with the first questionnaire, more people in the Education class (four) than in the other classes found the discussions exciting. As in the other classes this time, three people found the discussions motivating.

Interest builds up much faster. (Fred)

Some of the discussion have been uninteresting but the majority are quite motivating. (Dave)

I think that perhaps a student learns much more this way than by a definite course of studies such as history because the student can participate and thus is more interested in what he is doing. (Derek)

Four stated that from the interaction itself they had learned group skills and/or sensitivity.

If I knew enough about group dynamics I would be able to learn alot from the group such as it is. The main thing I have learned is the reactions of a group when they are introduced to a new type of learning situation, where it is up to them to organize and lead things. Frankly, I am disappointed in the group. (Miles)

I do not feel the interaction can be memorized or written on a test but this is mostly what I have learned. (Gord)

What personal gain?--for any amateur psychologist, this class and the provocation the structure of the course presents is built for analysis. (Laura)

I have learned to control shyness and speechlessness which is essential to me in the future (as a teacher). (Jane)

Substantive content

About the same number of people in this class as in the other two classes found defects in the content. About the same number found merits. The most frequently cited defect was in the lack of intellectuality in the discussions. The following comments are typical.

Much of the subject matter is mere trivia . . .
I am finding a lack of competition. (Miles)

More important topics could be dealt with in this course: e.g. civil rights, black power. (Barbara)

The only thing I feel may be lacking are definite facts. Many opinions are presented at times with little facts to support them. (Derek)

The most frequently cited merit of the substantive content was that the topics or field trips were interesting. Three people said that they learned as much, or more, in this course as in other courses.

I know that I have learned lots in the course. In fact, I feel that I have learned more in this class than my other classes where I have to learn some points definitely. At least in this course I pick up only facts that I'm interested in and would like to learn about, the rest I leave to someone else. (Hana)

I think that perhaps students learn much more this way than by a definite course of studies such as history because the students can participate and thus are more interested in what they are doing. (Derek)

I find learning much easier in this relaxed atmosphere. (Fred)

Fewer people in the Education class this time stated that they had learned from others' opinions. Still there were more in this class than in the other two classes. Fewer people in this class than in the other classes said that they had learned facts or insight about some topic. However the number of people having learned these things apparently doubled from the first period. "Hippies" was the topic most frequently cited. As was the case in the last period, fewer people in this class than in the other classes mentioned having learned sociology concepts either in particular or in general. The only four people in this period to say that they had learned but could not say what, were in the Education class.

I cannot answer this question about what I have learned. (Sam)

As I said before it is hard to pinpoint what I have learned. Many people not taking this system of Sociology have asked me the same question but frankly I find it difficult to answer and although I have learned much I can't say what or how much

but I definitely know I have learned. (Alice)

In this class I haven't learned anything very important but I haven't learned anything very really important in any of my classes. I suppose I may have learned something that I don't realize I have learned. (Marilyn)

It's hard to say exactly what I have learned. (Dave)

More people in the Education class than in the other classes during this period said that they had changed their philosophy in some way. The following comments are typical.

There is no learning in the class which outranks the continual knowledge each participant gains about himself, his prejudices, his standards of values and norms of acceptable social conduct. (Laura)

I feel as if I am experiencing a slight mind expansion. (Hana)

I have found that I am more liberal minded now and willing to accept than I have ever been before. (Gord)

One of the most interesting figures regarding substantive content is that 41% of people in the Education class noted, without evaluation, that "no conclusions" or "no decisions" were reached in the discussions. In part this was because an extra question was added to the second questionnaire asking the students to analyze the class, yet it is interesting that only one other person in the other two classes saw fit to comment about this aspect of his class. According to my perception, there were no fewer conclusions reached in the Education class than in the other classes. The explanation of this figure seems to be that the Education students were interested in the class from a professional point of view as well as an end in itself. Thus they were struck by the fact that the teacher did not give "the final truth"

after a discussion had been held on some topic. It is additionally interesting that the six people making this comment were among the quietest of the class. The following comment is typical.

Decisions in discussion in most cases have not been reached. The significance of these discussions is probably to view the different opinions and views of other people. (Jane)

Conclusions

The Education class was more organized in the second period and the discussions were calmer. Thus we see more appreciation of the teaching approach during this period than during the first period. There was more concern with organization during this period and more appreciation of the experience to be had from the interaction itself. The discussions were still exciting to more members of the Education class than of the other classes. Yet the same people did most of the talking during this period. One of the major concerns still seemed to be that not everybody participated in the discussions. However, there was only one suggestion that some people were talking too much. In general, the quieter people seemed to be at least as happy with the course as were the people talking. It was the quieter people who were most aware of the lack of conclusions in the discussions. People made less reference to learning and broadening through hearing other peoples opinions in this period of the Education classes. More reference was made to learning facts and insights about the topics under discussion. There seem to be two reasons for this: the topics were more concrete in the second period, and the class was no longer so entranced with the variety of opinions among them.

Mixed class

General attitude

Fewer people were ambivalent or non-committal about the course during this period, and fewer people expressed very enthusiastic attitudes. Christine was the only person to explicitly state that she was becoming a little disenchanted with the course.

At the beginning of the term, I was really excited about this class but at the present I am becoming a bit discouraged. I like the "idea" around this setup but feel as though we are going around in circles and never making any headway.

In contrast, Lyle now felt that was his best course.

In my opinion, this Sociology 202 course is a great success and one of the few educational and inspirational courses I have ever taken in my whole life as a compulsory student. It is the only course I have or ever did have that I truly want to participate in.

Teaching approach

Only one person mentioned a defect in the teaching approach. This was mentioned by Christine who felt that "we need a leader to help push or guide us." More people saw merit in the approach, both in the fact that there was no pressure associated with the course and that the students were free to learn what they wanted. More people in this class than in the other two classes noted the difficulties students had in adjusting to the new approach.

Structure of course

Fewer people in this class than in the other two classes were concerned that there was not enough organization. This was the only class in which more people this period were worried about lack of

organization. The three people who were concerned about this were Christine, Lyle and Reg.

The course generally is run fairly smoothly but occasionally we become bogged down because of a lack of something to say or a reluctance to say what we really feel. Perhaps this could be avoided by ensuring some sort of topics or discussions for each class. (Lyle)

The only thing I feel is lacking is a sense of direction. This could be because I may have been brainwashed by the system of authority and red-tape. It seems that though we are making headway we are wandering aimlessly and no one is quite sure what path or line of thought and reasoning we should follow. (Reg)

Fewer people this time than last stated that they saw merit in the fact that the class was a small group. There were far fewer people in this class than in the other classes making such comment this period.

Classroom interaction

While nobody in the Mixed class mentioned defects in the classroom interaction during the first period, six people mentioned such defects as existing during the second period. The most frequent complaint was that not everybody participated in the discussions. The following comments were made.

I really like the Sociology 202 course I'm taking except I think it should be with a group half our size because a lot of times about 4 or 5 kids never speak or give their opinion. Maybe they don't get a chance, or they are just not interested in what the discussion is about. (Vivian)

In the class itself, the heart of it lies among a group of five or six who have lots to say and say. If it were possible to get everyone involved as much as possible maybe the sociological problem within the group might be solved. (Margaret)

I feel that there could be more discussion in terms of numbers. (Dale)

I feel one thing is wrong. The main objective of this class is to form and express opinions. But I feel that a number of us, I for one, form opinions but do not express them mainly because there are a few "loudmouths" who, although they have nothing, they continually jabber and shut the "innocent" people up. (Louise)

As compared with the Education class, two of the three people who were worried about the lack of participation in the class complained about the domination of discussions by a few.

About the same number as before found the discussions exciting and motivating. Here are some examples.

It's often a tempting class to forget about but the interesting talk must have some effect because there have been few people missing. (Louise)

I like the course I am taking. For one thing it has stimulated interest in sociology. (Dean)

More in this class than in the other two classes said they had benefitted from the interaction itself. The following are typical comments.

Besides learning to like sociology I have gained knowledge of relationships of talking to persons around me and discussing questions I might not have thought of which pertain to the subject. (Dean)

I think I have gained confidence in expressing myself and listening to the ideas of others. (Godfrey)

I enjoy it. Have not gained any great wealth of knowledge but I feel I have gained a great deal of ease in sociological processes . . . have learned how to operate in groups and group discussions. (George)

More than specific knowledge on Hutterites, Frats, etc., I think I have learned something about people and about group organization.

The existence of an informal leadership group was clearly noted in the Mixed class.

Substantive content

More people in the Mixed class than in the other classes had criticisms of the content of the course, and there were more criticisms on this questionnaire than on the previous one. The most frequently cited criticism was that the discussions were often boring.

I find it lacking in that we seem to be getting bored with sitting around trying to think of something to talk about. I think that a lot of our silence is due to our lack of knowledge about the subject. (Godfrey)

Twice as many people on this questionnaire as on the previous one found merits to the discussions, however. Half the class said that the topics were interesting, one third said that they learned more with this approach.

After a few classes of heated discussions of fraternities I realized we were getting something of value from this class. We discovered problems sociologists encounter when giving sociology tests and various ways to interpret results obtained. We did not have to sit down and memorize this--instead we learnt it first hand. And instead of forgetting it after an exam it was retained as an experience. (Jill)

This freedom allows us to get almost a true "feeling" for sociology rather than just a lot of facts and abstract theories. (Reg)

As many people as before stated that they had learned facts or insight into the topics discussed. The topics most frequently were jails and Hutterites. Only half as many people as last time claimed that they had learned sociological concepts, but more people said that

they had learned from others' opinions. The comments of Dale and George are typical.

I have learned that mildly appearing persons can hold very strong convictions which seem to me to be radical. (Dale)

have learned how some people try to bring up plain simple facts and try to reason them without taking into account the whole situation and extenuating circumstances to resolve the discussion realistically. (George)

Three people stated that they had developed more of their philosophy through the course. This is what Lyle said.

I'm going to be perfectly honest with you, now. To me, the greatest education an individual can obtain is to know or understand about himself first. This course has given me the opportunity to observe society, to observe individuals (classmates) and as a result learn about myself.

Conclusions

The Mixed class considered more abstract questions during the third period. Discussion was more important as part of the class than it had been in the first period so that there were more merits and many more defects found in the interaction than there were in the first period. For some reason there was a marked decrease in the favourable mentioning of the fact that the class was a small group. More people mentioned defects in the discussions, but many more mentioned merits. The increase in both kinds of comments are probably due to the increased importance of discussions in the second period. In this respect it is significant that more people stated that they had learned from hearing others' opinions during this period.

Period 3

Arts Class

General attitude

There were few changes in the attitudes of the students in the Arts class toward the course. Tom still felt that the course "will never work under the present (spoonfeeding grades 1-12) system." Grant still felt that sociology was his best course because his other courses were "boring, irrelevant garbage and act more as a hindrance to what I find interesting than a help." Lana was non-committal about her feelings on this questionnaire. Serge (who had not returned the second questionnaire) now had strong negative feelings about the course.

In sociology this learning process, in my opinion has deteriorated to the point where it is almost as bad as some of my other classes.

He was the only person in all three classes to express unequivocally negative feelings about the class for any period after the first.

Teaching approach

As in the case of the second questionnaire, only two people in the Arts class cited defects in the teaching approach. Less than half as many people as last time listed merits to the teaching approach. Two people noted that there was no pressure associated with the approach, and one person that there was freedom to learn what one wanted. This decrease in merits cited occurred in the other classes as well.

Structure of course

As on the previous two questionnaires, four people this time complained about the lack of organization.

As yet, the course lacks direction and objectives, but no better method of personal interaction is found in any other teaching method I have yet found. (Jack)

I would like to see a more organized schedule, perhaps having field trips, films and talks planned a few weeks in advance thus eliminating the waste of time trying to organize these things during class time. (Sarah)

The course lacks in that there is no carryover--or very little--from class to class. We seem to just get started when the bell rings and we never do come to a climax or conclusion. (Geraldine)

It lacks organization--a definite pattern. (Bob)

More people this time cited merits in the fact that the class was a small group. Part of the reason for this increase is that the students in answering some of the extra questions on this questionnaire referred to merits arising from the size of the group. While only one person said that he had benefitted from being exposed to the teaching approach itself, his comment is sufficiently interesting to warrant reporting.

Although many people feel the first of the year was wasted, I don't think it was, because now, in another group such as this where we don't know anyone, I think that I will be more likely one of the persons to break the silence. (Jack)

Classroom interaction

Fewer people this time than last cited merits in the interaction itself. There were fewer in the Arts class than in the other

two classes making such appraisals.

There was an increase from last time in the number of people stating that they had benefitted in terms of learning to talk in a group and general group sensitivity from the fact of the interaction itself.

Substantive content

As in the other two classes, fewer people than before found defects in the substantive content. Two people complained about the lack of conclusions in the discussions this time.

Again, as in the other classes, there was a decrease in the number of people citing merits to the conte. As usual, most of these merits were that the topics or field trips were interesting. However, two people now saw the topics as practical. As in the other two classes, there was an increase from the last questionnaire in this kind of comment.

I like the free exchange of ideas and the topics we discuss. I think the relevancy of the topics has a great deal to do with what I get out of them. (Roger)

I found the topics interesting and relevant. (Alexandra)

Like the Education class, the Arts class had an increase this time, over the two previous times, in the number of its members who said that they had learned how to think as a result of the course. Here are the comments from the four who said this.

We've learned not to accept everything at face value and to delve underneath and find the real truth. (Laine)

One thing I have been made aware of, is that we

are all brainwashed, often to a great extent, so we won't even listen to an opposing side's argument. (Americanized, brainwashed, socialized.) (Grant)

I've come to not accept things for their face value and look into them further. I've gained both specific and a general knowledge from talking to people we interviewed and visited. (Roger)

A student can, if he is careful, learn to reason and formulate ideas for himself when presented with such diverse and topical opinions. (Jack)

About the same number of people this time said that their philosophy had developed, that they had learned from hearing others' opinions, and that they had learned facts or insights about the topics considered. As in the Mixed class, fewer people said that they had learned sociology concepts. Two interesting figures are that 27% of the class said they had become involved in life, sociology or politics as a result of the class, (whereas none had said this before), and that two people stated that they had learned but could not say what. Here are the comments of the people who said that they had become involved.

It has caused me to become interested in world affairs and politics, etc., something which I was never interested in before. (Jean)

But more important than learning simply about some trifling facts we are tackling some very important sociological as well as worldly concerns. In such a manner, most of us have become involved in life. I personally feel more involved in the life of the university and the affect it has on life around it . . . This developed one day from discussions on the U of A proposed march against the fees. The course has been a course in maturity and understanding. (Roger)

. . . it has increased my interest in reading, particularly on socio-political issues. (I don't think it was entirely sociology, probably

also friends' influence.) (Jack)

I have gained a greater perspective through views expressed and a little more involvement in such sociological matters such as social agencies, mental and penal institutions. (Geraldine)

Jack and Roger were also the people to say that it was difficult to say exactly what one had learned in the course.

Gains from this course are hard to assess because there is no need for recall (i.e. tests). (Jack)

I like the course and I feel as though I have gained a considerable amount of something from it but I can't say exactly what. (Jack)

Conclusions

In the third period, the Arts class continued from the second period a high degree of pre-planned activity. The theme of the topics continued to be: social problems. Despite this activity, four people still found the course lacking in "direction and objectives", "organized schedule", "carryover" or "a definite pattern". Fewer defects in the substantive content of the course were cited, but so were fewer merits. The most interesting figures are that four people said that the course had helped them be more critical or learn to think, and that four people said that they had become more involved in politics life or sociology. For both categories these are major increases over the number of such comments on previous questionnaires.

Education class

General attitude

The general attitude expressed toward the course by most students in the Education class was essentially the same as in the

second period. Gord was now the only person who was non-committal about his feelings. There were no generally ambivalent feelings expressed. Alice was especially enthusiastic about the class.

I like the course very much. Well that doesn't quite express it, but I like it better than any course I've ever taken in my whole life . . . lacking nothing!

Teaching approach

There were the same number of people citing defects in the teaching approach this time as last. Fewer people cited merits to the teaching approach. Perhaps reflecting the decline in planned activity during the third period, only two people this time, (as opposed to seven last time) cited as a merit the fact that one could study what one wanted. This time only one person, Ralph, suggested that he had learned about a new approach to teaching through this course.

Through this course, I have gained an ideal of University life and if the opportunity arises, shall endeavour to realize my ideal.

As was the case last time, three people noted that it takes time to adjust to this kind of class.

Structure of course

Four people, (the same number as last time) said that they were dissatisfied with the amount of organization in the course. Two of these, Miles and Laura, had said this last time. Fewer people said that they found merits in the fact that the class was structured as a small group. The greatest decrease was in the comment that "students can hear others".

Classroom interaction

In general, there were far fewer comments about classroom interaction on the third questionnaire. Only nine made any such comment at all. Now only one person complained about the lack of general verbal participation. This was Barbara, one of the few people who were not clearly "talkers" or "non-talkers". Still, however, a quarter of the class found the discussions exciting.

There was a great increase in the number of people stating that they had benefitted from the interaction itself. For the first time in this class, there were comments to the effect that some members of the class had learned how to listen to others. These comments were by Alice and Eleanore.

I've learned to listen, to think and to respect other people for what they are--human beings--not only for what they can do for me. (Alice)

I think I have learned to listen to others instead of just waiting for people to say their piece. (Eleanore)

Perhaps the fact that there were no comments about the informal leadership in the class suggests that it was now an accepted part of the class, and not worth commenting on.

Substantive content

As in the other classes, fewer people in the Education class cited defects in the substantive content this time than was the case in the second and third periods. Also, fewer people cited merits to the content this time than did so last time. Again this was also the case in the other two classes.

As in the Arts class, more people stated on this questionnaire that they had learned how to think than had so stated on the previous questionnaires. This is Gregg's comment.

I have . . . developed self criticism when it comes to arguing--logic.

On the other hand, no people this time said that their philosophy had developed. About the same number of people as last time said that they had benefitted from hearing other people's opinions and had learned facts and insights about the topics discussed. Insight was more frequently cited than facts.

For the first time, people said that as a result of the course they had become involved in life or sociology. Here are the comments of the two people concerned.

I have developed increased interest in social problems, specifically the use and abuse of drugs, the Hutterite question, juvenile delinquency. (Laura)

Often the discussions are and I often find that I learn from listening to what others say. Often class discussions develop an interest for me in subjects I have never really thought of before. (Linda)

Conclusions

During this period of the Education class, there was a decreasing amount of pre-planned activity. There were some tense sessions when we talked about the class's process in the middle of the period, but the class then returned to much the same style it had adopted during the early part of the year. There were no large major differences between the type of response to this questionnaire and the type of response to the previous questionnaire.

Mixed class

General attitude

There were no significant changes in the expressed general attitudes toward the courses in this period from the attitudes expressed on the last questionnaire.

Teaching approach

For the first time in this class, two students said that the approach allowed too much freedom.

This course is the ultimate in easiness. By this I mean in terms of preparation. This is where it lacks. There is no "pressure" upon the student to prepare for the discussion even though books have been suggested for reading. Being the lazy person that I am, I have not read any of the assigned works. Even though convention has been discarded I feel that I have gained something which cannot be written. (Dale)

I think the course would have been more interesting if we had had some definite outline to follow. (Sally)

This was the only period of any of the three classes in which no person praised the teaching approach for allowing students to learn what they wanted.

Structure of course

Many more people this time than at any previous time said that they found the course lacking in terms of organization. It is interesting that this great increase only occurred in the Mixed class. The following comments are typical.

The course unfortunately seems to be lacking in a sense of direction. Although it has and still is accomplishing a lot it still appears to have no

real goal. (Reg)

I enjoy sociology once we get on a topic and everyone really gets involved. I think though, that we change topics too quickly. We'll just get going on something and start really thinking about it on our own and when we really begin to formulate our own theories we have already started on something new. (Maybe I'm just slow???) I'm not saying we should stick to something till its dead but we change topics so fast that we don't have time to really learn anything. Like why didn't we visit the court right after the jail. (Kate)

I think the class is interesting, however, one serious complaint is the amount of time spent in getting a discussion started is considerable. The reason being that it is difficult for anyone to get into a serious discussion without everyone being organized at the start. However the organization should not be too formal again or the class would soon loose its atmosphere of free expression. Also, I often wish the time could be extended when a good discussion is going for good points are often lost when it is forced to stop early. (Barry)

All but two people in the class cited merits in the fact that the class met as a small group. More people in the Mixed class mentioned such merits than in either of the other two classes. A relatively high 69% said that the class was good because you could speak out. Here are some of the comments.

In the informal discussion of our class, I feel it brings out each individual's reasons and feelings towards the different problems. (Brad)

By discussing we can share our ideas with everyone else and also broaden our field with theirs. (Margaret)

I really like the Sociology course I'm taking. At least in this class I don't have to worry about what I should or shouldn't say. I can say what I really feel and not have to worry about saying things only that will be along the same lines of thinking as the prof. I don't have to talk to get a high mark. (Vivian)

More people in this class at this time cited as a merit the fact that

one could hear the opinions of others in this class. A very large number also said that students are able to meet others in the class.

Classroom interaction

Half as many people this time saw defects in the classroom interaction. One person complained about the lack of participation, two others about the dominance of the class by a few members.

More students than at any previous time, found the discussions exciting. Here are three of the comments.

It is relaxing to go to class and it wakes me up since we sometimes get into heated discussions. (Jill)

The sociology course is a very worthwhile and beneficial course as compared to the rest of my courses. I find my other classes dull, boring, frustrating and incompetent in view of material and organization or presentation of material. (Lyle)

I myself don't say very much but I listen to other person's opinions and this is stimulating, especially when you hear an opposite point of view on the subject. (Lorraine)

The same number of people this time as on the two previous questionnaires stated benefits which had been derived from the interaction itself. The most frequently benefit was learning to talk in groups. Here are a few of the six comments.

I have gained self-confidence through self-expression of my actual feelings in which any other course I suppress. (Lyle)

I have gained self-confidence in talking with people that are not close friends. (Christine)

I gained from it the ability to present an argument supporting my viewpoint. (Jill)

As in the Education class, more people this time than on any

of the previous questionnaires, states that they had learned to listen to people. This is Margaret's comment.

I have learned to share my ideas, not to disagree with someone until he's fully explained his idea and I can understand it.

Substantive content

Fewer people on this questionnaire than on the previous questionnaire found defects in the substantive content. Two people found the discussions lacking in intellectual quality and two found the discussions boring at times. Seven people listed merits to the course, mostly that the topics were interesting. However, two of these people said the discussions were practical and relevant. This was more than had said this previously.

There was an increase in number, (to eight) of the people who said that they had learned from hearing others' opinions. There was a decrease in the number of people saying they had learned sociological concepts or facts and insight about the topics discussed. The most frequently mentioned topic was the "Hutterites". Three people said that their philosophy or understanding of themselves had developed as a result of the class. Three people on this questionnaire, as opposed to two on the second questionnaire and one on the first, said that as a result of the class they had become more involved in society. Here are their comments.

Probably the most important thing this course has done for me is really made me think about things I never would have before. (Kate)

Sociology is very interesting--have learned that it is important for people to be aware of social

problems in order for society to function. (Dean)

I gained from it an interest in politics, (realized
I knew very little about them.) (Jill)

Finally three people, more than before, said that they could not say what they had learned.

Conclusion

During the third period, the Mixed class spent more time on ad hoc discussions than it had in the previous two periods. This fact seems to account well for the fact there were more people complaining about the lack of organization on this questionnaire, (and more than in the other classes); that there were more merits seen in the fact that the class was a small group, (particularly because one could express one's opinions); that more people said that the discussions were exciting or stimulating; that more people found the topics considered relevant to them; and that more people said that they had benefitted from hearing others' opinions. As in the other classes, more people now said that they were getting interested or involved in something because of the course.

Period 4

Arts Class

General attitude

In general, the attitudes toward the class seemed to be more positive at the end of the last period than they had been previously. In part this might have been due to the fact that the reactions were given verbally this time. Lana and Jack were assertively non-

committal on their feelings about the course.

Teaching approach

There are more comments of all kinds because of the probing in the interviews and the opportunity to write at length on the final "examination". Thus it is less meaningful to compare figures for this period to those of the previous periods than it is to compare figures among classes and within the period for any one class.

Forty percent of the Arts class said that the teacher should lead more in the class. Most of these people felt that at the beginning of the year, I should have organized a field trip so that the class could get to know each other better and thus avoid the strain this class felt during the first period. Fewer people in the other classes said that there should have been more leadership. Two people felt that there was too much freedom in the class. This is Serge's comment.

As for the possibilities for learning in a non-directive group, it would be impossible especially for first year students. A group which has never experienced a class situation like this before needs some direction, someone with a little more knowledge about sociology to act as an elaborator and a source of knowledge.

More students in the Arts class than in the other two classes felt that more sociology should have been learned in the course. In all, more students in the Arts class listed defects in the teaching approach than did students in the other two classes.

There was an approximately equal number in all three courses citing merits to the teaching approach. Four people in the Arts class

referred to the lack of pressure in the course, six referred to the fact one could learn what one wanted in this type of class. This is Alexandra's comment.

I think this type of non-directive learning benefits the student much more than the directive method. A student is not forced to do research that he has no interest in and does because he has to--with rebellious attitudes building up.

A large number of students in all classes said that such a class was difficult to adjust to. Here are some of the comments.

Participation in a class such as this is very difficult after being through 12 years where you did nothing but sit in a desk and allow relevant (at least from an examination standpoint) material to be pounded into your head. Thus people when confronted with a class such as this was confused and don't really know where to begin. (Serge)

Possibilities for learning in a non-directive class like ours are fantastic. The reason why this potential wasn't developed too greatly this year was because we had not experienced such freedom before--most of us had been trained up to this time to regurgitate testbook material and we didn't know what to do.

Because this was my first year in such a class I think I took advantage of this position. I did as little as possible but I really enjoyed it. With some training in such a group I'm sure I would be able to learn better. (June)

Structure of course

Over half the students complained about the lack of organization in the class. Three-quarters of the class appreciated the fact that one could speak out, hear others or meet others in such a course. This was the only class in which students noted that organization had improved through the year. Three people stated this.

Classroom interaction

More in the Arts class than in the other two classes complained about the lack of vitality in the discussions. There were no other defects in the interaction cited. This was the only class in which this was so.

As in the Education class, a large number of the people in the Arts class found the discussions motivating. Here is Laine's comment.

When someone started talking about a topic you had the freedom to express your view of if you did not know anything about it you became interested and wanted to know more.

More of this class than of the Education class, but fewer than of the Mixed class, stated that they had gained from the interaction itself. Four people said that they had learned to talk in a group more confidently, but most said that they had generally gained experience about participating in groups. Fewer in the Arts class said that informal leadership existed in the class and more said explicitly that it did not. This is what Serge said.

I was surprised that a strong leader did not develop among the group. Perhaps nobody wanted to accept the responsibility of organizing field trips and directing conversations. However, the main factor involved here is that most students in the class were equal to their peers in every way, academically, socially, intellectually. Also, most of the people were pretty strong-willed and independent. It would be hard for any one person to dominate such a group.

Substantive content

Fewer people in the Arts class than in the other two classes mentioned defects in the content of the course. In contrast to the other classes, the major defect cited was that the class did not reach conclusions in the discussions. All people in the Arts class mentioned

that they had found some topics or field trips interesting. As in the case of the education class, two-thirds of the people said they had learned more in this course than in other courses, or that they would retain longer what they did learn. The following comment by June is typical.

Most people would agree that the best way to learn something is to discuss it from very possible angle. This can only be done in a class like ours where opinions and knowledge differ so greatly.

An equal number of people said that they had learned from hearing others' opinions, as said that they had learned facts or insight from the topics discussed. In both cases, there were more Arts students than students in other courses making these comments.

Conclusion

In reviewing the year, the Arts class was the most ambiguous in its feelings about the teaching approach. More dependancy on the teacher was manifested than in the other two classes. The major complaints about the course were that there was a lack of organization in the structure and a lack of vitality in the discussions. There was a feeling by half the class that informal leadership did not develop to the extent that most people would have expected. The other half of the class commented on the existence of such leadership. Most students were satisfied that they had learned in the courses both content and skills in group interaction. However, more than half said that such a class requires a lot of time to adjust to.

Education class

General attitude

There were no significant changes in the general attitude of the class from the last period.

Teaching approach

Fewer people in the Education class than in the other two classes cited defects in the teaching approach. More in this class cited merits. There was less concern with the teacher's leadership than there was in the other two classes, but almost as many people who were concerned about not having learned more sociology. As in the other two classes, more people expressed favourable feelings about the fact that a person could learn what he wanted in this course than praised the lack of pressure. Two-thirds of the class said that students needed time to adjust to this kind of class. The following comment was made by Sam.

I feel that our class may not have been the best example of a non-directive class since we were never exposed to this type of stimulation before. We all came out of the old school system where the teacher was god. The fear of the old system was still with us. We may have thought this was something we were getting away with. . . I think we may have had the idea that if we did not take advantage of the situation we may never get another chance. (Sam)

Structure of course

As compared with more than half the students in each of the Arts and Mixed classes, only 29% of the Education class referred to the lack of organization in the course. About the same number of students

cited benefits regarding the fact that the class was a small group.

Classroom interaction

More students in the Education class than in the other classes complained about the classroom interaction. Specifically, six complained about the hostility in the interaction. Only one other student of both the Arts and Mixed classes, made this complaint. Three complained that a few people dominated the discussions. This complaint was again only made once in the other two classes. The following comment by Barbara is typical of the comments by these three.

It . . . seemed that the people with the "biggest mouths" were usually occupying the leadership role. At the very beginning of the classes, the ones with the "biggest mouths" seemed to be totally dominating the discussion possibly inhibiting others from talking.

As in the Arts class, about half the students found the discussions motivating. Fewer in the Education class than in the other two classes said that they had benefitted from the interaction itself. It is interesting that fewer in the Education class than in the Mixed class identified informal leadership as existing. Nevertheless half did so, while only one claimed that there was no such leadership or "peer group pressure."

Substantive content

As in the Mixed class, about half the Education class found defects in the content of the course. The complaint most frequently made was that the discussions lacked intellectually. All members of the class found merit of one kind or another in the topics. Five

people, more than in the other two classes, found the discussions immediately relevant to their lives. Over half the students, claimed they had learned more in this course than in others. The following comment by Linda is typical.

The student can learn more in such a non-directive class than in a more traditional class because he is learning what he wants to. A discussion that particularly interested him in class will often cause him to go and read further material on the topic-- and allow him to have a broader understanding.

There had been a steady decrease, from the first period, of people stating that they had learned from hearing others' opinions stated. Now, only one-quarter of the class made this claim--fewer people than in either of the other classes. As in the other classes about half said they had learned facts or insight about the topics discussed. Four people said that they had become involved in society, or had become more interested in sociology as a result of the course. One person, Fred, said that his philosophy of life had changed as a result of the course. He had learned to appreciate "straight" people and no longer thought that drugs were so important.

Conclusion

The Education class were generally more favourably disposed toward the course than the other two classes. Fewer defects and more merits to the approach were cited. The major problems in the class were seen to be in the interaction. There were more defects in the interaction cited in this class than in the other two classes, but fewer defects in the structure. On the other hand, more people in this

class found the discussions motivating in some way.

Mixed class

General attitude

Whether or not it was because of the fact that the comments on this questionnaire were derived from the interviews, the attitudes expressed at the end of the year, were generally less favourable toward the Mixed class than they had been previously. Only two indicated very enthusiastic attitudes, while five were non-committal or ambivalent.

Teaching approach

Fewer people cited merits to the teaching approach in this class than in the other two classes. In particular, only two people mentioned that there was no pressure associated with the course. About the same number of people as in the Education class mentioned defects in the approach. As in the other two classes, about half the students said that it would take time to adjust to this approach to teaching. More than in the other classes, students said that they were initially suspicious about the course thinking either that I wanted just to get them to like me or that I was "putting them on".

Structure of course

More students in this classes complained about the lack of organization in the course. About the same number of people in this class as in the other two classes saw merit in the fact that the class was a small group. More in this class said that they had made friends.

Classroom interaction

Only one-quarter of the class cited defects in the classroom interaction. This was a smaller percentage than in the other classes. On the other hand, fewer people in this class cited merits in the interaction, but more said that they benefitted from the fact of the interaction itself. More people in this class than in the other two classes commented on the existence of a leadership group in the class.

Substantive content

More people in the Mixed class than in the other two classes criticized the content of the course. The comment most frequently made was that the discussions were unintellectual. Seven people made this comment. Comments about the merits of the course were in similar number to the comments made in the other classes. Only half the class said that they had learned facts or insight about the topics discussed. More in this class than in the other two classes said that their philosophy had developed as a result of the course. As compared with five people in each of the Arts and Education classes stating that they had become more involved in society as a result of the class, only one person in the Mixed class made such a claim.

Conclusion

Perhaps because the year had ended for the Mixed class with such little organized activity, this class was most concerned about the lack of content in the course and the lack of intellectual discipline in the discussions. Perhaps this fact also helps account for

the decrease in the computed average rating of the general attitude in the Mixed class. There were fewer criticisms of the classroom interaction in the Mixed class and fewer merits listed. However, more people in this class claimed to have benefitted from the interaction itself--a fact consistent with the increased emphasis on spontaneous discussion at the end of the year. For the same reason, this class was most aware of the informal leadership in the class. There was a decrease from previous periods in the number of people mentioning that they had learned facts or insight about the topics discussed and an increase in the number of people stating that their philosophy had developed.

Summary

General attitude

The greatest difference among classes in terms of general attitude was in the first period. The Education class was very enthusiastic, the Arts class much less so, and the Mixed class was intermediate in attitude. The differences narrowed by the second period, but the order, judging from the computed average rating, remained the same until the fourth period when there was a drop in the satisfaction expressed in the Mixed class. These trends reflect the facts that the Education class began the year very vigorously, that the Arts class began it painfully searching for topics of common interest, and that the Mixed class concluded the year with a period of spontaneous discussions instead of the planned activity it had been accustomed to.

The differences between the way in which the Education class began the year and the way in which the Arts class began reflecting the personalities of the respective groups. The manner in which the Mixed class concluded the year seems due to external factors such as forthcoming examinations in other courses and the fact that the class knew it was soon going to dissolve.

While 71% of the Education class said at one time or another during the year that they found the sociology course their best, only 33% of the Arts class and 13% of the Mixed class made this claim. Only 18% of the Education class indicated ambivalent or non-committal feelings during the year, while the figures for the Arts and Mixed classes were 40 and 56% respectively.

Teaching approach

There were no uniform trends in the making of comments about any aspect of the teaching approach. In part this may be due to the way in which the data was collected.

Overall, more people cited merits in the teaching approach at least once than cited defects in the approach at least once. The most frequently cited single comment (by 77% of the students) was that the approach allowed students to study what they wanted. In comparison, only 19% of the students ever said that there too much freedom in the course; only 63% cited any defect at all. 63% of the students also cited as merit the fact that there was no pressure in the course and the same number noted that it takes time for students from the traditional educational system to adjust to such a new climate. On the

whole, it seems that the students appreciated the freedom granted them, both because this meant that they were no longer under pressure and because it meant that they could develop their own activities. Yet they were concerned that they were not prepared to adequately use this freedom. Even most of the criticisms of the method were based on this feeling rather than being a total rejection of the approach.

More students in the Education class than in the other two classes cited merits in the approach at one time or another during the year. Fewer cited defects. In fact no members of the Education class ever said that there was too much freedom in the approach. More students in the Education class also said that it took time to adjust to this type of learning, but fewer students than in the other two classes said that they had initially been suspicious of the class. It seems that the Education class was either more excited about the class because of the liveliness of practically all sessions, or that they were more conscious of the possibilities in the method because of their occupational aspirations. The fact that 41% of the Education class said that they had benefitted from being exposed to the teaching method would seem to bear out the latter idea.

Virtually an equal number of students in the Arts class as in the Mixed class made comments of each type, regarding the teaching approach, at one time or another during the year.

Structure of course

All classes showed a trend to feeling increasingly dissatisfied with the amount of organization in the course. However, the trend

only looks significant in the case of the Mixed class. Otherwise there were no uniform trends in the making of comments about the structure of the course.

All but one person saw merit in the fact that the class was a small group which allowed a person to speak out, to hear others and to meet new people. Of the three, the fact that a person could talk in the class seemed most important. It was mentioned by 81% of all students at one time or another during the year. More people mentioned each of the merits than criticized the course for lack of organization. One might suggest the need of people to express themselves is badly stifled in the regular education system.

More people in the Arts class than in the other two classes complained about the lack of organization in the class's proceedings. The fewest number of people making this complaint were in the Education class. The Mixed class was most impressed with the fact that one could speak out in class, while the Arts class was most impressed with the fact that one could hear others' opinions. These figures reflect the different personalities of the majority of students in the two classes. It is further interesting that more Arts students than others listed as a benefit at least once, the fact that one could meet people in this class.

Classroom interaction

In terms of comments on classroom interaction, there are trends in the Education class in the number of people commenting that "too few participate", that "some dominate the class" and the discussions

were exciting!" These three categories are related.

In the Education class, there is a steady decrease through the year of people stating that too few participated in the discussions. Correspondingly, there is steady increase of people saying that some dominate the class and a steady decrease in the number of people saying that the discussions are exciting.

At one time or another, 92% of all students stated that they had benefitted from the interaction itself. The single comment made by most people was that students had gained group sensitivity. Two-thirds of all people cited one or another defect in the interaction, and two-thirds cited merits of one kind or another. The merit cited by most was that the discussions were motivating, the defect cited by most was that too few participated in the discussions. Two-thirds of all people noted the existence of informal leadership in their respective classes. The experience of the class itself was important to more people, we may conclude, than what was good about the interaction and what was bad. Most people appreciated the opportunity to develop their social skills.

More people in the Education class than in the other two classes cited merits to the interaction, but more of the Education class also cited defects at one time or another. These figures point out the ambiguity of feelings in this class which was exciting yet exasperating.

More students in the Education class were concerned at one time or another that too few people participated and more were con-

cerned about the hostility in the discussions. The Arts class had the most people who were concerned about the lack of vitality in the discussions, the fewest people concerned about the "non-talkers", and the fewest concerned about the fact that some dominated the class.

Fewer people in the Arts class than in the other classes cited the discussions as exciting, while the percentage was highest in the Education class.

The Arts class had the fewest people saying that informal leadership existed in the class and the most saying that informal leadership did not exist and that decisions were difficult to make.

All these differences reflect the different moods of the classes: the slowness of the Arts class and the excitement of the Education class particularly.

Substantive content

Certain trends are evident in the Arts class. Increasingly through the year, members of this class complained about the lack of conclusions in the discussions. A decreasing number said that their philosophy or understanding of themselves had grown through the class, and it was only in the last two periods that people said that they had become involved in matters because of the course. This data does not seem to fit together in any meaningful way, although each trend is consistent with the report of the proceedings in Chapter IV.

In the Education class, the number of people saying that they had learned from others' opinions steadily decreased through the year. In the Mixed class the number of people saying that they had learned sociological concepts steadily decreased through the year.

All students mentioned one merit of the content at least once during the year. Four-fifths mentioned one defect at least once. At one time or another, about half the students criticized the discussions for lacking intellectual discipline, but 69% said at one time or another that they had learned more in this course than in other courses. A surprisingly small one-quarter of all students said that the topics were immediately relevant to them.

As might be expected, all but one student said that they had learned facts or insight about the topics which had been studied. More surprisingly, four-fifths of the students said at one time or another that they had learned from hearing others' opinions. The times at which these respective benefits were cited differed for each class. One-quarter of the students said that as a result of the course they were more thoughtful, four-fifths that they now knew more about themselves or had a more developed philosophy, one third that they had become involved in sociology, politics or just plain "life", and three-fifths that they had learned sociological concepts. One-quarter said at one time or another that they did not know what they had learned, but that it was something.

The Education class had more members who criticized the quality of the discussions, the Arts class had more members who criticized the fact that conclusions were not reached in discussions.

More people in the Education class found the topics practical than did people in the other two classes.

A greater percentage of the Arts class than of the other classes stated that they had learned how to think more critically or

more clearly and a larger percentage had become more interested in things because of the class. A relatively small number of the Mixed class (56%) stated that they had learned from hearing others' opinions. A relatively small number of the Education class (35%) stated that they had learned sociological concepts. These figures are readily comprehensible in terms of the proceedings which have been described in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

In three experimental classes, teaching was conducted as democratic leadership. The first class involved 15 students in the Faculty of Arts; the second, 17 students in the Faculty of Education; and the third, 16 students from the Science, Household Economics and Physical Education Faculties. All students were in their first year of university and had come directly from high school. One half of each class was composed of girls.

The purpose of the experiment was to develop some understanding of the processes which would develop in democratic classes, and from this understanding to raise more general questions about the process of learning.

In this chapter, the conclusions of the research are described in terms of each class. A final comparison of the classes presents more general findings about the development of the three classes. The last section of the Chapter presents some ideas for further research in this area.

Summary of findings

Arts class

As many students noted in their evaluations, the Arts class had no definite leadership group. All students were less extroverted than some members of each of the other two classes. The result was that the class had difficulty "getting off the ground". When, in

December, it began to do so, it was the scene of a large number of activities for some three months until the year-end academic doldrums developed. Many of the students had careers planned in social service, and readily applied themselves to studying various social problems once the avenues for doing so appeared to them. Forty-seven percent of this class said at one time or another that they felt more involved in society as a result of the class and forty percent said that the class had helped them think more critically. These were larger percentages than in the other two classes and reflect the greater thoughtfulness of the students in this class.

Throughout the year the class had trouble knowing what to do with itself whenever it ran out of pre-arranged activities, although a useful discussion would always develop. Often this would take much of the session's time. While some people felt that was wasted time, and would have liked more leadership from the teacher, others said they appreciated the fact they themselves were to take responsibility for the class.

Education class

In marked contrast to the Arts class, there were several students in the Education class who were very aggressive. On the other hand, there were several students who found it extremely difficult to talk in the class. This polarization was the major source of strain in the class through the year. It is interesting to note that it was the dominant students who were originally more concerned about this. The quieter students found the discussions exciting even though they

did not participate verbally themselves. Later, the discussions were found to be less stimulating and more exasperating because of the often undisciplined excitement. Discussions were so vigorous in the early part of the year that there was little need felt for organization of the class. In later November, however, the class planned a series of visits to innovative schools in the city, and these were followed by speakers and field trips on a variety of subjects.

Perhaps because the students were all planning to be teachers, they seemed to appreciate the freedom more than did students in the other two classes. Forty-one percent of them said that as a result of the class they had some new ideas about education.

Mixed class

The Mixed class had a leadership group, but it was not as vigorous as that of the Education class. Because the leadership group was less dominant than that of the Education class, it was more quickly opposed. Perhaps it was for this reason also that the group was more inclined to organize activities than to initiate exciting discussions among themselves. By the second session this class had begun a study of fraternities which was to take two months. As this topic was finished, other projects were undertaken until early March when the activity died out, and the class spent most of the remaining sessions in spontaneous activity. The discussions of this class became increasingly abstract in orientation.

The class was anxious at the end of the year about the lack of organization. This is in contrast to the other two classes which were

accustomed to unplanned sessions by this time.

Because the class started the year with such organized activity, the year was three-quarters past before a majority of students stated that they had learned from hearing others' opinions. This is in contrast to the other classes in which 72% and 81% of the students respectively made this claim on the first questionnaire. Conversely, 81% of the Mixed class said that they had learned something about a topic on the first questionnaires, as compared with 14% and 38% in the other two classes.

Comparison of classes

As one reads the proceedings of the experimental classes, and looks at the trends in the students' evaluations of the classes, certain similarities in all three classes appear. In terms of the analytical categories employed in this thesis, the following dimensions appear to be primary in all three classes:¹

<u>Analytical category</u>		<u>Dimension</u>	
1. Teaching approach			
a) initial decisions:	autocracy	versus	democracy
b) day-to-day decisions:	detachment	versus	involvement
2. Structure of course:	organization	versus	spontaneity
3. Classroom interaction:	widespread	versus	vigorous
	participation		debate
4. Substantive content:	facts	versus	opinions

In regard to teaching approach, I made an initial decision to play the role of teacher as democratic leader. However, there were still decisions to be made while in the class: should I be detached from the class as a whole by being Socratic and hesitating before stating my feelings so as not to intimidate students, or should I act naturally, expressing all feelings and stating points directly rather

than eliciting them from the class? This dimension of detachment-involvement cut across the question of how much I should talk about sociology, for I could do it in two ways: by talking about what I felt they should know (being detached) or by talking about what I thought was important in terms of backing up my own claims (being involved). As the year progressed, I became more involved in my teaching. This was clearly true in terms of the way I presented my sociological knowledge, for I became freed from the need to show that these classes could learn as much traditional sociology as a traditional class. To some extent, I also became more frank in stating my own feelings as I came to know the students better. The question of how much I should participate in the discussions directly, however, continued to bother me throughout the year, and by April I had not found a satisfactory way of answering this question for myself. It seemed to be a tension which is necessarily a part of democratic teaching.

The other three dimensions: organization versus spontaneity, vigorous debate versus widespread participation, and facts versus opinions were tensions faced by each class as a whole. While the classes respectively tended to one pole or another, at any given time, (chiefly because of differences in personality but also because of external events such as approaching final examinations in other courses,) there was a continuous feeling of a need to move toward the other pole. Thus the Arts and Education classes began the year with spontaneous discussions, became frustrated that they were not organized and moved in Period 2 toward more pre-planning. Conversely, the Mixed class moved from a tightly organized program to more spontaneity in Period 2.

Vigorous debate and widespread participation are not logically in necessary opposition, yet in the experimental classes this was empirically the case. Vigorous debate seemed to inhibit participation from the quieter members. Thus the Arts class had the most widespread participation, but constantly felt the need for more excitement in the discussions as Table 5:4 shows. Conversely, the Education class was typically involved in vigorous debate but worried about the fact that not all participated in the discussions. Vigorous debate in the Education class indicated involvement by students - even by the quiet students. Widespread participation in the Arts class indicated detachment. Students in this class often felt a need to talk to fill up the numerous quiet gaps. This is not to suggest that widespread participation in a class is only possible when students are uninvolved, but rather that in these classes such a dilemma existed. The Mixed class was closest to achieving a balance between widespread participation and vigorous debate - a balance which developed as the year progressed.

The conflict between the search for facts and the appreciation of opinions is the most interesting. The students' conception of "fact" seemed to be essentially: something which is said by a person who has had direct experience with a subject. Thus when the students had visited the jail, they felt that they could now talk about penology on the basis of some facts. A professor was judged to be an expert on "the family" if he was married himself, a person from China could present facts about that country, Fred could present facts about the hippies. Opinions were statements made which had no basis in personal concrete experience. Thus, Fromm was dismissed because he talked about

love on an abstract level but did not discuss personal experience. Other students' ideas on ideology, religion, human nature, sex, etc. were considered as opinions. Both facts and opinions were regarded as valuable, but for different reasons. Facts provided an expansion of knowledge, hearing opinions encouraged a broadening of minds, and in some cases the further development of a personal philosophy.

In general, the acquiring of facts was associated with organization of the program, while listening to opinions was associated with spontaneous discussions. This was because in these classes organization of the program meant planning field trips or planning to hear visitors speak about personal concrete experiences. However, vigorous debate and widespread participation were both related to the sharing of opinions with each style of interaction having its own advantages. Facts seemed to be seen as non-debateable.

Implications

Generalizing from the experience of the three experimental classes discussed in this thesis must be undertaken with an awareness that the classes were in introductory sociology and lasted for one full academic year. The students were of a certain age range and high-school background. Further, different personalities in each class could have radically changed the course of that class.

Nevertheless, generalizations should be suggested; for, as the previous sections in this chapter shows, the differences as well as the similarities in these classes can be accounted for by postulating

the existence of common dialectical tensions in all three classes. Whether such tensions exist in other classes composed of different students in different circumstances must be a question left to further research.

If tensions do exist in all learning groups between the need for facts and the need for opinions, between the need for organization and the need for spontaneity, and the need for vigorous debate and the need for widespread participation, then what Rogers says is true: "you can trust the student."² Although different personalities and different situations will result in different kinds of activities in different democratic classes, there will constantly be the recognition that the other side to the class must be developed. If a class is too much oriented to concrete "facts" in its deliberations, it will move to abstract sharing of opinions; if it is too spontaneous in its programming it will move toward organization so as to increase the degree of factual learning through direct experience and exposure to authorities; if it suffers too much excitement in its discussions it will move toward greater participation by the quieter members. Moon is quite correct when he states that students will search for structure eventually--in their own time and in a way which meets their needs.³ Time, that is to my experience with democratic teaching, is a crucial variable in determining the activity of a democratic class.

While teachers are valuable additions to the classroom, we may conclude that it is not necessary for them to impose some sort of structure on the class on the assumption that students cannot, or will not, do it themselves. Apart from sharing his knowledge, the teacher

need only encourage the class to take upon itself responsibility for its own direction. With increasing experience in democratic classes, students will become increasingly able to perceive their own needs, (as individuals and as a class,) to articulate these needs, and to grow intellectually.

Suggestions for further research

1. As 63% of the students pointed out, the dimension of time is of crucial importance in the development of a democratic class. The experimental classes continued for seven months, and thus extended over a longer period of time than have most experiments of this type. However, even this much time was apparently not long enough for the students to really feel at home in the new approach to teaching. As Appendix G briefly points out, in the second year of this type of class there is much quicker planning of activities and abstracting of principles.

Research should be carried out on experimental classes extending over longer periods of time. A less satisfactory form of research would be an ex post facto study of people who have participated in democratic educational experiences for varying lengths of time.

2. The experiment which has been analyzed in this thesis was conducted within the confines of a traditional university system. One-fifth of all students in the experimental class said at one time or another through the year that students in a democratic class within the present university system tend to "take advantage of their freedom;

i.e. that they devote time to other courses which ordinarily would be devoted to sociology.

Research should be conducted into discovering what happens when students are involved in democratic classes in a "free university" or in "free schools" such as Summerhill. (Of course, no school in this society can be completely outside the education system. One is constantly aware of the need for certification, and even students in "free schools" must think about the prospect of entering university in order to get a degree.)

3. One of the tensions seen in the classes is in the day-to-day decisions made by the teacher regarding his role. Should he be detached or involved at any given moment? Should he "teach sociology" or not? How much leadership should he provide? After I divested myself of the role required by the design of the original experiment, I was able to more naturally be a part of the class. I answered these questions by simply doing what "felt" best at the time, by considering myself as a person in the classes rather than the holder of any special role.

It has been suggested, however, that it would be useful to know more specifically what "being yourself" means, especially as it is interpreted in a democratic classroom situation. An experiment which focussed on a teacher who regarded his place in the class in this way would help to clarify this matter. This would have practical significance for persons concerned with democratic classrooms, and might lead to some interesting theoretical questions about what is regarded as "authentic" behaviour.

4. The experimental classes on which this thesis is based involved first year university students between the ages of 17 and 20.

Different age ranges in the classes would almost certainly lead to different kinds of content in the course, different degrees of organization and different patterns of interaction than obtained in the experimental classes discussed in this thesis. It was suggested in the previous section, that a universal need of all democratic learning groups might be to have both organization and spontaneity, vigorous debate and widespread participation, presentation of facts and consideration of opinions. It is difficult to conceive how democratic learning groups could avoid developing activities which fall under all of these categories, but what in practice this meant for different ages would be of interest. In addition, the position of the teacher with very young children is an open question.

5. Cross-cultural comparisons of democratic classes could be addressed to the question: are the needs, hypothesized in the conclusions of this thesis, evident in democratic learning groups composed of students from other cultures. If so, then we would know more about "the nature of man" and would be able to formulate concepts for a universal education system--a system which trusted the students.

6. Although some of the data were available, little attempt was made in this thesis to trace the developing activity and feelings of the individual members of the classes. Such a study would be of large proportions. It would be an important complement to the sociological descriptions of the classes as groups. In particular, resistance to the idea of democratic teaching, and the ways in which it increases or

decreases, should be studied. This would have important ramifications for a social-psychological theory of freedom.

7. Experiments in democratic teaching have always been conducted in the social sciences or humanities. Such experiments should also be conducted in courses where there is a premium on the learning of technical facts. It is commonly assumed - even by people who endorse democratic teaching in the social sciences and humanities - that full democracy cannot be allowed in natural science or technical courses. This is an assumption which should be tested. It may be that democratic teaching is applicable to all types of knowledge, that all learning is a process which is most efficiently carried out in a fully democratic environment.

FOOTNOTES

¹The polarities of the dimensions observed in the experimental classes, reflect William James' distinction between "tough-minded" (mental make-up) and "tender-minded". James also said that people have a need to be both scientific (tough-minded) and religious (tender minded). See William James, Pragmatism and Other Essays (New York: Washington Square Press, 1963), pp. 9-12.

²Carl Rogers, Client-Centered Therapy, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951), p. 427.

³Samuel Moon, "Teaching the Self", Improving College and University Teaching, 1966, pp. 228-9.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Asch, M. J. "Nondirective Teaching in Psychology; A study Based upon a Controlled Experiment", Psychological Monographs, No. 3, 1951.
- Duberman, Martin. "An Experiment in Education", Daedalus, Winter, 1966.
- Faw, V. E. "A Psychotherapeutic Method of Teaching Psychology", American Psychologist, 1946.
- Gibb, Lorraine and Gibb, J. "The Effect of the Use of 'Participative Action' Groups in a course in General Psychology." Paper read at 1952 meetings of the American Psychological Association Abstract, American Psychologist, 1952.
- Glaser, Barney G. and Strauss, Anselm L. The Discovery of Grounded Theory, Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967.
- Gross, L. "An Experimental Study of the Validity of the Non-Directive Method of Teaching", Journal of Psychology, 1948.
- Guetzkow, H., Kelly, E. L., and McKeachie, W. J. "An Experimental Comparison of Recitation, Discussion and Tutorial Methods in College Teaching," Journal of Educational Psychology, 1954.
- Kelley, H. and Pepitone, A. "An Evaluation of a College Course in Human Relations", Journal of Educational Psychology, 1952. This study is unique in the 1940's and 1950's in that measures are taken over time of the students' ability to analyse social interaction. It was found that insight increased continuously in these student-centered classes.
- Koenig, Kathryn and McKeachie, W. J. "Personality and Independent Study", Journal of Educational Psychology, 1959.
- Landsman, T. "An Experimental Study of a Student-Centered Learning Method," Unpublished doctor's dissertation, Syracuse University, 1952.
- Lewin, Kurt. Resolving Social Conflicts, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948.
- Mann, Richard D., et al. Interpersonal Styles and Group Development. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967.
- McKeachie, W. J. "Student-Centered vs. Instructor-Centered Instruction", Journal of Educational Psychology, 1954.

- McKeachie, W. J. "Students, Groups and Teaching Methods," American Psychologist, 1958.
- Mills, Theodore M. Group Transformation: An Analysis of a Learning Group. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.
- Moon, Samuel. "Teaching the Self," Improving College and University Teaching, 1966.
- Neill, A. S. Summerhill, New York: Hart Publishing Company, 1960.
- Patton, J. A. "A Study of the Effects of Student Acceptance of Responsibility and Motivation on Course Behaviour". Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of Michigan, 1955.
- Rogers, Carl. Client-Centered Therapy, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1951.
- Schwebel, M. and Asch, M. J. "Research Possibilities in Non-directed Teaching", Journal of Educational Psychology, 1948.
- Slater, P. Microcosm: Structural, Psychological and Religious Evolution in Groups, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

APPENDIX A

ANALYSIS OF SUBSTANTIVE CONTENT

Although the focus of this thesis is on understanding why the students did what they did and how they felt about it, it is of interest to note the extent to which the experimental classes discussed material which is found in a typical introductory textbook.

The text in use in other introductory sociology courses being taught at the same time was Francis Merrill's Society and Culture.¹ Tables A:1, A:2, A:3 and A:4 indicate the occasions on which the discussions or field trips were related to one or another of the chapters in Merrill's book during the first, second, third and fourth periods respectively. (Field trips conducted during times other than a normal session are not included in these tables.) The information in these four tables is summarized in Table A:5.

The criterion for including an item in these tables was its being considered for some fifteen minutes or more. In some cases, an item was considered for a whole period. Needless to say, in some instances some people learned a great deal from discussing a certain item; in some instances there was little being learned. Further, the listing of occasions was often arbitrary as many topics we discussed did not fit neatly under any one heading. For instance, in discussing birth control, classes might consider virtually at the same time: primary groups, group norms, personality and social structure, population, class, social institutions, the family, social change and social problems.

¹ Frances E. Merrill, Society and Culture, 3rd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall Incorp., 1965).

Table A:1--Dates, and nature of occasions, during period of year covered by first questionnaire, on which specified sociology topics were considered, by class.

Sociology Topic	Class		
	Arts	Education	Mixed
Study of Sociology	Oct. 3: nature of evidence Oct.24: objectivity Oct.26: history of science Oct.31: history of science Nov.14: nature of evidence		Oct. 3: methodology Oct.10: methodology Oct.12: methodology Oct.17: methodology Oct.19: methodology Oct.24: methodology Oct.31: methodology Nov. 2: sociological questions Nov. 7: methodology Nov. 9: ethics, social science
Social interaction	Nov. 2: symbolic interaction		
Group interaction	Nov. 3: class process		Oct. 3: decision-making
Primary groups	Oct.12: fraternities Nov. 9: love	Nov. 2: love	Oct. 3: fraternities Oct.10: fraternities Nov.30: fraternities
Secondary groups			
Group norms	Oct.24: conformity Oct.26: sex norms		

Table A:1--continued

Sociology Topic	Class		
	Arts	Education	Mixed
Culture	Oct.12: Quebec Oct.26: Sex concepts Nov.28: Hutterites	Oct. 3: "Hippies" Oct.19: religion Oct.24: religion Nov. 2: free love	Oct. 3: Hutterites Nov. 7: Hutterites Nov.16: Hutterites Nov.21: Hutterites Nov.30: Hutterites
Personality and the group		Nov.14: socialization, Riesman	
Personality and social structure	Oct.19: anomie, Merton Oct.24: anomie Nov. 7: capitalism, Fromm Nov. 9: Fromm	Oct. 5: motivation Nov. 7: capitalism, Marx, Fromm Nov. 9: Indians' problems	Oct. 5: anomie
Personality and culture	Nov. 2: nature of man, Freud Nov.14: free will/determinism Nov.16: behaviourism	Oct. 5: nature of man Oct.10: nature of man Oct.17: Freud Oct.19: behaviourism/existentialism	Oct. 5: nature of man
Population	Oct.18: birth rates among poor		
Race			
Caste			
Class	Oct.19: poverty		

Table A:1--continued

Sociology Topic	Class		
	Arts	Education	Mixed
Mobility	Oct.19: anomie, Merton	Oct.31: prostitutes, call girls, anomie, Merton	
Social Institutions	Nov.16: universities Nov.21: university	Oct. 5: education Oct.19: youth agencies, religion Oct.24: religion Nov.14: education Nov.21: universities	Nov.23: university
Bureaucracy		Nov.21: universities	
The Family	Oct.31: functions Nov.23: functions, types		
The Community		Nov. 9: community development	
Human Ecology			
Social Change	Oct.12: Québec	Nov. 9: community organizing Nov.16: revolution Nov.16: revolution	
Collective Behaviour			
Crowd and Public	Oct. 3: propaganda		

Table A:1--continued

Sociology Topic	Class		
	Arts	Education	Mixed
Mass Society Social Problems		Oct.17: emotionally dis- turbed children Oct.31: prostitution Nov. 2: social problems Nov. 9: Indians' problems	

Table A:2--Dates, and nature of occasions, during period of year covered by second questionnaire, on which specified sociology topics were considered by class.

Sociology Topic	Class		
	Arts	Education	Mixed
Study of Sociology	Dec. 7: social science Jan. 9: small groups lab Jan.23: study of sociology	Jan. 9: small groups lab Jan.23: careers in sociology	Jan. 7: small groups lab Jan.23: Comte, positivism
Social Interaction		Jan.30: minority groups	
Group Interaction	Jan. 9: small group experiments	Jan. 9: small group experiments	Jan. 7: small group experiments
Primary Groups		Jan.25: love	
Secondary Groups			
Group Norms			
Culture		Jan. 4: youth's music Jan.11: youth's music Jan.30: Chinese community	
Personality and the group			Jan.11: self-esteem, socialization Jan.23: self-esteem, socialization
Personality and Social Structure		Dec.12: status of women	Dec.19: sources of crime Jan.11: female roles

Table A:2--continued

Sociological Topic	Class		
	Arts	Education	Mixed
Personality and Culture	Dec.12: nature of man Jan.18: Canadian Indian	Jan.23: determinism	
Population	Jan.18: world poverty		
Race	Jan.18: American Negro	Jan.30: race/nationality	
Caste			
Class	Jan.30: social class		
Mobility			
Social Institutions	Dec.12: penal system Dec.19: justice system Jan. 4: justice system Jan.23: Central Intelligence Agency Jan.30: university	Dec. 5: education system Dec. 7: education system Dec.14: education system Dec.19: education system Dec. 5: education system	Dec.12: penal system Dec.14: penal system Jan.11: education system
Bureaucracy			
The Family			

Table A:2--continued

Sociology Topic	Class		
	Arts	Education	Mixed
The Community		Jan.25: resource allocation, social control, freedom	Jan.23: communism/capitalism Jan.25: communism/capitalism Jan.30: communism/capitalism
Human Ecology	Jan.18: cities		
Social Change	Jan.18: theories of history	Jan.25: community/organizing	
Collective Behaviour			
Crowd and Public			
Mass Society			
Social Problems	Dec.12: penal system Dec.14: juvenile delinquency Jan. 4: justice system Jan.11: poverty Jan.25: crime Jan.30: crime	Jan.25: poverty Jan.30: drugs	Dec.19: crime, penal system Jan. 4: juvenile delinquency Jan. 9: penal system Jan.23: poverty Jan.30: penal system

Table A:3--Dates, and nature of occasions, during period of year covered by third questionnaire, on which specified sociology topics were considered by class.

Sociology Topic	Class		
	Arts	Education	Mixed
Study of Sociology		Mar.12: definitions, objectivity, nature of evidence	Feb.20: sociological analysis
Social Interaction	Feb. 1: assimilation	Feb.15: minority groups	Feb.20: functionalism/ conflict theory
Group Interaction		Feb.20: classroom interaction Feb.22: classroom interaction	Feb. 6: classroom interaction
Primary Groups			
Secondary Groups			
Group Norms		Feb.29: birth control	Feb.15: birth control Feb.20: birth control Feb.22: prohibition Mar.14: generation gap
Culture		Feb. 8: Hutterites Feb.13: Chinese community Feb.15: Hutterites, Hippies	

Table A:3--continued

Sociology Topic	Class		
	Arts	Education	Mixed
Personality and the group			Feb.22: personality front
Personality and social structure	Mar. 5: alienations of youth Mar. 7: alienations of youth		Feb.22: alcoholism Mar.19: status of women
Personality and culture	Feb. 1: Indians' culture	Mar.14: nature of man	Feb.27: nature of man
Population		Feb.29: birth control	Feb.15: birth control Feb.20: birth control
Race			
Caste			
Class	Feb.29: privilege/discrimination	Mar.14: problems of poor	Mar. 5: problems of poor Mar. 7: problems of poor
Mobility			Mar. 7: upward mobility
Social Institutions	Feb. 6: education system	Mar.14: police	Feb. 1: university Feb.27: education system
Bureaucracy	Feb.27: penal system Feb.29: penal system	Mar.14: classroom discipline	

Table A:3--continued

Sociology Topic	Class		
	Arts	Education	Mixed
The Family		Feb.29: birth control	Feb.15: birth control Feb.20: birth control
The Community	Feb.29: guaranteed annual income	Feb.15: political leadership	Mar. 5: communism/capitalism
Human Ecology			
Social Change	Feb.13: penal system Feb.22: imperialism Feb.29: penal reform Mar.12: Vietnam	Mar. 5: nature of power Mar.12: social change Mar.14: difficult for poor	Feb. 1: progress, cultural lag, concepts of history Feb.20: birth control Feb.22: social change Feb.27: university politics Feb.29: tuition fees Mar.12: Vietnam Mar.14: generation gap, technology
Collective Behaviour	Mar. 7: direct action Mar.12: direct action, Vietnam	Mar. 5: civil disobedience Mar.12: protest march	Feb.29: tuition fees Mar.12: Vietnam
Crowd and Public Mass Society		Mar.12: propaganda	Feb.11: Nazi Germany

Table A:3--continued

Sociology Topic	Class		
	Arts	Education	Mixed
Social Problems	<p>Feb. 1: penal system, Indians' problems</p> <p>Feb. 6: social work</p> <p>Feb. 8: penal system</p> <p>Feb.13: penal system, mental hospital</p> <p>Feb.15: social work, welfare</p> <p>Feb.20: welfare, Indians' problems</p>	<p>Feb. 1: welfare, drugs</p> <p>Feb. 6: drugs</p>	<p>Feb. 8: juvenile delinquency</p>

Table A:4--Dates, and nature of occasions, during period of year covered by fourth questionnaire, on which specified sociology topics were considered by class.

Sociology Topic	Class		
	Arts	Education	Mixed
Study of Sociology	Apr.11: sociological questions		Mar.21: social science
Social Interaction			
Group Interaction			Mar.28: definition of group
Primary Groups			
Secondary Groups			
Group Norms	Apr. 4: fashions		
Culture	Apr.11: Hutterites Apr.16: Hutterites	Mar.26: Hippies	Mar.26: Hippies
Personality and the group		Mar.19: socialization	Mar.28: American Negro soldiers
Personality and social structure		Apr.16: youth movements	Mar.21: anxiety about war Mar.28: American Negro
Personality and culture		Apr.11: normality	
Population			

Table A:4--continued

Sociology Topic	Class		
	Arts	Education	Mixed
Race	Apr. 9: American Negro	Apr.11: discriminations	Mar.28: American Negro
Caste			
Class	Mar.19: political awareness		
Mobility			
Social institutions	Mar.28: religion	Mar.26: universities Apr. 2: education	
Bureaucracy			
The Family			
The Community	Mar.21: science and power Apr. 2: rural changes	Mar.19: science and power Apr. 4: rural/urban life	Mar.28: urbanization Apr. 2: political conventions
Human Ecology		Mar.28: city core Apr. 9: cities Apr.11: cities	Mar.26: city core Mar.28: cities Apr. 9: cities
Social Change	Mar.19: Vietnam Mar.21: progress Apr. 4: fashions	Apr.11: American Negro	Apr. 2: Vietnam, revolution Apr.11: American Negro

Table A:4--continued

Sociology Topic	Class		
	Arts	Education	Mixed
Collective Behavior	Apr. 9: American Negroes	Apr.11: American Negroes Apr.16: American Negroes, youth movements	Apr.23: revolution Apr.11: American Negro
Crowd and Public		Mar.21: media, McLuhan	Mar.19: media, McLuhan Mar.21: media, McLuhan
Mass Society	Mar.11: political apathy Mar.21: scientists' ethics	Mar.19: scientists' ethics	Apr. 2: political impotence
Social Problems		Mar.26: drugs, Hippies Apr.16: Indians' problems, welfare	

Table A:5--Total number of sessions in which various sociology topics were discussed, by class.

Sociology topic	Number of sessions in which topic was discussed			
	Arts	Ed.	Mixed	Mean
Study of Sociology	9	3	14	8.7
Social Interaction	2	2	1	1.7
Group Interaction	2	3	4	3.0
Primary Groups	2	2	3	2.3
Secondary Groups	0	0	0	0.0
Group Norms	3	1	4	2.7
Culture	5	11	6	7.3
Personality and the group	0	2	4	2.0
Personality and Social Structure	6	5	7	6.0
Personality and Culture	6	7	2	5.0
Population	2	1	2	1.7
Race	2	2	1	1.7
Caste	0	0	0	0.0
Class	4	1	2	2.3
Mobility	1	1	1	1.0
Social Institutions	9	12	6	9.0
Bureaucracy	2	3	0	1.7
Family	2	1	2	1.7
Community	3	5	6	4.7
Human Ecology	1	3	3	2.3
Social Change	9	7	9	8.3
Collective Behaviour	3	5	4	4.0
Crowd and Public	1	2	2	1.7
Mass Society	2	1	2	1.7
Social Problems	12	10	6	9.3
Mean	3.6	3.6	3.6	

APPENDIX B

READING, ATTENDANCE, INTEREST IN SOCIOLOGY AND
LEVEL OF VERBAL PARTICIPATION

On each questionnaire, the students were asked to report what they had read related to sociology, how many classes they had missed in this and other courses, and what they were planning in terms of future sociology courses. The information they supplied on these matters is summarized on Table B:1.

While the amount of reading steadily decreased through the year in the Arts and Education Classes, the most amount of reading by students in the Mixed class took place in the third period. More was read in the Education class than in the other two classes in every period except the third. The Education class read the most in total.

Fewer classes (sessions) were missed in the Mixed class than in the other classes during the first and second periods. More classes of the Mixed class were missed during the third and fourth periods. The average number of classes missed was 6.94 or 13.4% of the total number of sessions in the year.

In the first, third and fourth periods, more classes had been missed in more other courses taken by students in the Mixed class, than by students in the other two classes. In all three, at least one other course (as an average) was attended by these students less than was sociology.

The computed proportion of students planning to take further sociology courses is highest in the second period for the Arts class,

and highest at the end of the fourth period for the Mixed and Education classes. The highest proportion of Arts students "thinking about majoring in sociology" was in the first period, the highest proportion of Education students was in the second period, and the highest proportion of other students was in the last period. It seems that the Arts students were influenced by the course in a negative way toward sociology, that they felt uncomfortable not having the background in sociology that other majors would, or that they were most open to any ideas about majoring at the beginning of the year and later found more interesting fields to major in. Whatever the reason, it appears that the course had a deterrent effect on people thinking about majoring in sociology.

On the third questionnaire, the students were asked to state their reasons for coming to class, to indicate if they felt guilty about missing classes, and why. They were also asked which quarter of the class they were among in terms of verbal participation in the class, or to indicate if they were in the top decile.

In all three classes, most people said that they came to class "to discuss". In the Education class, however, an equal number said that they came because they "did not want to miss anything". For the three classes combined, the order of the frequency of reasons was: "to discuss", "to avoid missing anything", "because the class was interesting and/or enjoyable", "to learn and/or to go on field trips", because of the people".

Four-fifths of the Arts class as compared with about half in the other two classes said that they felt guilty about missing classes.

The reasons for feeling guilty, averaged over all three classes, were in order of frequency: "letting down the class", "letting down one's self", "that one had always felt guilty", "that one was letting down the teacher", "that one was going to assign himself a good mark so he should attend". There was a marked difference between the Education class and the other two classes in that 6% of the former cited letting down one's self as a reason while a third of each of the other two classes cited this as a reason. Conversely, the least frequent response in each of the other two classes was that missing class was "letting down the teacher", while it was tied with "letting down the class" as the most frequent response in the Education class.

The interaction patterns of the three classes are evident from the data on self-assigned ratings of verbal participation. The largest number of people in the Arts class rated themselves as being in the middle level of verbalness. Conversely, in the Education class the fewest number of people placed themselves at this level. In the Mixed class, there was a rather even spread among the levels. In general people tended to rate themselves higher than could objectively be the case. Thus forty-six per cent of the people rated themselves in the top twenty-five percent of the class.

In contrast to the other classes, almost as many people said that their participation had decreased in the Education class as said that it increased. This indicates that the atmosphere in the Education class was less conducive to encouraging people to talk than it was in the other classes.

Table B:1--Summary of reports from each class on reading, attendance and interest in sociology, by period of year covered by questionnaire.

	Arts Class					Education Class					Mixed Class					All
	Questionnaire Period					Questionnaire Period					Questionnaire Period					
	1	2	3	4	all	1	2	3	4	all	1	2	3	4	all	
	N=14	N=14	N=15	N=14	year	N=17	N=17	N=17	N=17	year	N=16	N=16	N=16	N=15	year	
Mean number of books read ^a	1.9	0.8	0.8	0.3	3.8	2.8	1.3	1.4	0.3	5.8	0.7	0.9	1.8	0.2	3.5	4.4
Mean number of classes missed (cumulative)	1.1	3.0	5.1	6.1	6.1	1.4	3.8	5.2	8.2	8.2	0.9	1.9	4.6	6.4	6.4	6.9
Mean number of courses in which more classes missed than in sociology	0.6	1.3	1.1	1.1		0.9	1.5	0.8	1.2		1.2	1.2	1.4	1.2		
Number of students definitely planning to take further sociology courses	7	9	8	7		11	11	10	11		6	11	11	14		34 ^c
Number of students possibly planning to take further sociology courses	7	4	4	7		2	2	2	5		7	4	5	1		13 ^c
Computed proportion of students planning to take further sociology courses ^b	.75	.79	.72	.75		.65	.71	.69	.79		.59	.81	.84	.94		.84 ^c
Proportion of students thinking about majoring in sociology	.64	.50	.43	.43		.29	.35	.25	.24		.31	.31	.25	.33		.31 ^c

^aAll books listed were counted. All articles listed were counted together as one-half book.

^bThis proportion was computed by counting all persons definitely planning to take further sociology courses as 1.0, all persons as "possibly" so planning as 0.5.

^cThese figures are the average of the three classes' figures on the last questionnaire.

Table B:2--Percentage of each class making specific responses regarding attendance and verbal participation in class.

Item	Class			Total
	Arts N=15	Ed. N=17	Mixed N=16	
Stated reason for coming to class				
like the people	7	12	25	15
can be self	0	12	13	8
to discuss	47	47	63	52
to learn, for field trips	20	35	19	25
class interesting, enjoyable	27	35	25	29
do not want to miss anything	27	47	19	31
time is convenient	0	12	19	10
will give self good mark	0	18	13	10
Feelings of guilt about attendance				
feel guilty about missing classes	80	47	56	60
do not feel guilty about missing classes because have an excuse	7	24	19	17
do not feel guilty about missing classes	13	29	25	23
Total	100	100	100	100
Reasons for feeling guilty				
going to take good mark	0	6	13	6
"letting down" teacher	13	29	6	17
"letting down" class	27	29	19	25
"letting down" self	33	6	31	23
force of habit	27	12	25	21
Self-ratings of verbal participation in class				
Among most verbal 10%	20	18	25	21
Among most verbal 25%, but not most verbal 10%	20	35	19	25
Among most verbal 50%, but not most verbal 25%	33	6	25	21
Among most verbal 75%, but not most verbal 50%	13	12	19	15
Among least verbal 25%	13	29	13	19
Total	99	100	99	101
Participation increased since beginning of year	47	24	44	38
Participation decreased since beginning of year	13	18	6	13

APPENDIX C

LEVEL OF VERBAL PARTICIPATION AND LOCATION OF HIGH SCHOOL

Table C:1 suggests a strong relationship between degree of verbal participation in class and high school background in terms of location. Urban students tended to be more verbal than rural students. All people in every class who rated themselves among the most verbal 10% of their class were from urban high schools. Seven of the nine people who rated themselves among the least verbal 25% of their class came from rural high schools. It is interesting that the Education class had a higher percentage of students from rural high schools, 47% as opposed to 33% in the Arts class and 25% in the Mixed class. This fact accounts in part for the dichotomy in the Education class between the talkers and the non-talkers.

Table C:1--Number of students at each level of verbal participation who attended high school in urban or rural area, by class.

Location of High School	Level of Verbal Participation				Total
	1st Decile	1st Quartile ^b	2nd Quartile	3rd Quartile	4th Quartile
<u>Urban^a</u>					
Arts class	3	1	4	1	1
Education class	3	4	1	1	0
Mixed class	4	3	2	2	1
Sub-Total	10	8	7	4	2
					31
<u>Rural</u>					
Arts class	0	2	1	1	1
Education class	0	2	0	1	5
Mixed class	0	0	2	1	1
Sub-Total	0	4	3	3	7
					17
Total	10	12	10	7	9
					48

^aHigh schools are defined as Urban if they are in Edmonton or Calgary; or within 15 miles of these cities, and therefore served by teachers living in these cities.

^bDoes not include persons listing themselves as being in first decile.

APPENDIX D

REACTIONS TO THE EXPERIMENT

On the third questionnaire, students were asked to indicate the effect that the small group laboratory, the questionnaires, and the fact of the experiment itself had had on them. Table D:1 presents the results.

The majority of students in all three classes said that the small groups laboratory had no effect on them or their participation. Most of the remainder said that the laboratory had been relaxing. Only three students indicated that it had some other (undefined) effect.

Two-thirds of the Education class said that the questionnaires had had no effect but only a quarter of the other two classes said this. More of the students in these two classes said that the questionnaires had caused them to think about the class. Five people said that the questionnaires had given them a better chance to express their feelings about the course. However, three people felt guilty because of the questionnaires.

About half the students in each class stated that the experimental nature of the course had no effect on their participation. Five people were bothered in some way because of the fact that the class was experimental. Six people said that they wanted to see the experiment succeed.

We may conclude that the small groups laboratory had little impact on the participation beyond the fact that the room itself was

more comfortable than the old seminar room, and therefore facilitated conversation. The questionnaires seemed useful as a device to get people thinking about the course and allowed them to express their feelings about it. The experimental nature of the course bothered five people and encouraged six others to work more, in order that the course should "succeed". This data suggests that the experiment itself had more effect on actual participation than either the laboratory or the questionnaires.

Table D:1--Percentage of each class stating that small groups laboratory, questionnaires, or fact of the experiment itself had specified effects on them.

Item	Class			Total N=48
	Arts	Ed.	Mixed	
	N=15	N=17	N=16	
Effect of small group laboratory				
no effect	53	53	63	56
more relaxing than seminar room	40	35	38	38
had some undefined effect	7	12	0	6
Total	100	100	101	100
Effect of answering questionnaires				
no effect	27	65	25	40
made one think about class	40	6	31	25
made one think about university	13	0	0	4
was a chance to express feelings	7	12	13	10
made one feel guilty about reading	13	0	6	6
was boring	0	18	25	15
Total	100	101	100	100
Effect of the fact that the class was experimental				
no effect	47	53	56	52
more relaxing	13	24	13	17
did less work	13	6	6	8
was suspicious	7	0	6	4
wanted to see it succeed	20	6	13	13
bothered in an undefined way	0	12	6	6
Total	100	101	100	100

APPENDIX E

EXAMINATIONS AND GRADES

As in other experiments with democratic teaching in a regular university, the problem of grades was of continual concern. It had been decided previous to the classes' first sessions that the matter would be left in the hands of the students. The regulations would be explained to them, and they would be responsible for determining how the classes were to meet the requirements. The matter was discussed several times during the year, it finally being resolved in March that each student would assign his own mark. Each class came to this decision separately. The Education class had little difficulty making such a decision. The Arts class and the Mixed class discussed the issue at some length, considering alternatives such as each person receiving the same mark, or marks within limits being assigned randomly.

Table E:1 summarizes the decisions, and reasons for the decisions, which each person made regarding marks. The University of Alberta is on the "stanine system" whereby a "9" is the top mark possible to receive, a "1" the lowest possible. The students all chose quite high marks. This was particularly so in the Education class. (For purely practical reasons, I arbitrarily reduced all their "9's" to "8's" and all their "8's" to "7's".)

It appeared that in the fact of no indication from myself as to what criteria should be used for assigning marks, students looked to each other for clues. In the Education class, the lack of concern

by the leaders in choosing a "9" led to the development of a norm calling for students to take the highest mark possible, so as not to be a "sucker". It is interesting that more students in the Arts class and in the Mixed class indicated that they worried about the mark to assign themselves, and that their final decision was said frankly to be for the sake of their average. Either students in the Education class were less honest in revealing their reason for picking the mark they did, or else they felt that it was a proper mark. More than in the other classes, the Education students presented some justification for their mark.

Table E:1--Percentage of each class assigning self specific mark and making specific comment about mark.

Item	Class			Total N=48
	Arts N=15	Ed. N=17	Mixed N=16	
Mark assigned				
"9"	7	47	6	21
"8"	47	29	44	40
"7"	47	34	50	40
Total	101	100	100	101
Comments				
mark deserved	40	65	31	46
mark not deserved	7	6	31	15
mark chosen is approximately average in other courses	7	35	6	17
mark chosen to raise average	33	6	56	35
was worried about what mark to assign	33	12	25	23
felt obligation to students not in class	0	6	13	6

APPENDIX F

COMPARISONS OF STUDENTS IN THE EXPERIMENTAL CLASSES
AND STUDENTS IN A TRADITIONAL CLASS

Forty-eight students were selected from a traditional class consisting of two lectures a week plus one seminar of about 30 students per week for each student. These students were selected according to the same criteria as the students in the experimental classes. All students chosen from the traditional class were in their first year of university and had been (with only a few exceptions) in high school the previous year. As many male and female students in Arts were chosen as were in the experimental Arts class, as many in Education as were in the Education class, as many in Science, Household Economics and Physical Education combined as were in these faculties in the experimental Mixed class. Because it was the end of the year when the students in the traditional class were contacted, not all were able to come for the interview. Most of these students were from rural homes.

The data from the questionnaires issued to the students in both the experimental classes and the students from the traditional class, is summarized in Tables F:1 to F:10. Randomness of selection of the students in the two types of class has been assumed, and measures of significance have been computed on the differences between certain groups in their responses to certain questions. There were no significant differences (at the .05 level) between the two groups of students in terms of: attitude toward their respective classes;

attitude toward general academic work (although there was a statistically insignificant tendency for the students in the experimental classes to like their other academic work less than the students in the traditional class;) work done in sociology relative to other courses; number of classes (sessions) missed during the year; number of students planning to take further sociology courses; number of students "thinking about majoring in sociology"; and number of students stating that their first year of university had resulted in a broader outlook on life. The only statistically significant differences (at the .05) level between the students in the experimental classes, (as a group) and the students in the traditional class (as a group) was that the students in the experimental classes reported having read more, and would more likely advise students in future sociology courses of the kind they took to get involved in the class or seminar.

There are some interesting differences between sub-groups. The Arts students in the experimental class did relatively as much work in sociology as did the Art students in the traditional class. This was not true in the case of the students in the other two experimental classes. On the other hand, the students in the Mixed experimental class skipped fewer classes than did their comparable numbers in the traditional class, whereas this was not the case with the students in the Arts and Education experimental classes. The Arts students in the traditional class seemed to have found sociology an easier subject and therefore did less work in it than in most other courses, but they also attended the classes (particularly the seminars) more faithfully than did the students in the "professional" faculties who had to work

harder in sociology while enjoying it less.

The most striking comparison is that more students in the experimental Mixed class than in the other experimental classes said that they would take future courses in sociology. Fewer comparable students in the traditional class, compared with Arts students and Education students, said this. Further, whereas more Arts and Education students in the traditional class than students in the experimental Arts and Education classes said that they were "thinking about majoring in sociology", the reverse was true in the case of the other students.

There was a bigger difference between the "other" students in the traditional class and the students in the Mixed experimental class with regard to feeling broadened through university than there was between the Arts and Education students in the experimental classes and their comparable numbers in the traditional class.

There was a significant difference between students in the experimental classes and students in the traditional class with regard to the advice they would give to students entering the same course in future years. The greatest difference was between the students in the Mixed experimental class and their comparable number in the traditional class. More students in all experimental classes would advise future students taking the same sociology course to "get involved" in the class.

The experimental course was, it seems, differentially most appealing to the students not in Arts or Education. Data in Appendix G with regard to return rates for the continuation of the experimental

course also points this out.

In many cases there were proportional differences between the most verbal students in the two types of classes (according to their own ratings) and the least verbal students. The former liked their respective sociology courses better, read more, were more interested in taking further sociology courses and majoring in sociology, and were more likely to advise future sociology students to "get involved" in their respective classes. On the other hand the most verbal students in the traditional class did relatively less work in sociology than did the least verbal students. In contrast to the case in the traditional class the most verbal students in the experimental classes missed fewer sessions than did the least verbal students. In general we may say that the more verbal students in both types of classes were more involved in their sociology courses than were the least verbal students, although the most verbal students in the experimental classes felt free to skip classes, and the most verbal students in the traditional class found it less necessary (relative to other courses) to work in their sociology course.

Table F:1--Size of samples of students from experimental class and students from traditional class.

	TOTAL	ARTS STUDENTS	EDUCATION STUDENTS	OTHER STUDENTS (a)	"MOST (b) VERBAL 25%"	"LEAST (b) VERBAL 25%"
Experimental Classes	48	15	17	3 Sc. 16 5 HE 8 PE	6 Arts 22 9 Ed. 7 0.	2 Arts 9 5 Ed. 2 0.
Traditional Class	36	14	11	3 Sc. 11 4 HE 4 PE	7 Arts 11 3 Ed. 1 0.	1 Arts 10 1 Ed. 8 0.

Experimental class and the comparable groups from the traditional class included approximately equal numbers of males and females

(a) Among "other" students, "Sc" for Science
"HE" for Household Economics
"PE" for Physical Education

(b) Students were asked to rate themselves as among the most verbal 25%, second most verbal 25%, etc. of their class, (in the case of the experimental classes), or of their seminar section (in the case of the traditional class.) Thus the reason that proportionately more "other" students are among the most verbal 25% of the experimental classes than of the traditional class, is probably due in part to the fact that in the former case they were grouped together in a class thus requiring some to be among the most verbal 25%. Note that the designation "most verbal 25%" or "least verbal 25%" is a matter of perception of one's role in the class.

Table F:2--Mean student ratings of respective classes, by specific groups, on 5-point scale; (from 5 for "liked class very much" to 1 for "disliked class very much")

	TOTAL	ARTS	ED.	OTHERS	MOST VERBAL	LEAST VERBAL	
Experimental	4.6 (S=0.48)	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.8 (S=0.41)	4.0 (S=0.47)	t=2.5 p < .01
Traditional	4.7 (S=0.33)	4.8	4.8	4.4	4.8 (S=0.54)	4.2 (S=0.75)	t=0.8 p > .10

Table F:3--Mean student ratings of general academic work, by specific groups, on 5-point scale; (from 5 for "liked it very much" to 1 for "disliked it very much")

	TOTAL	ARTS	ED.	OTHERS	MOST VERBAL	LEAST VERBAL	
Experimental	3.5 (S=0.81)	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.8	
Traditional	3.9 (S=0.77)	3.9	3.9	4.0	4.3	4.0	

t= 0.8
p > .10

Table F:4--Mean numbers of courses in which less work done than in Sociology, by specific groups (a)

	TOTAL	ARTS	ED.	OTHERS	MOST VERBAL	LEAST VERBAL
Experimental	0.8 (S=0.84)	0.7	0.8	0.9	1.2	1.3
Traditional	1.1 (S=0.75)	0.6	1.5	1.4	0.8	1.5

t=1.65
p > .05

(a) An average score of 0.0, for example, would indicate that no student did less work in any other course than in sociology. A score of 1.0 would indicate that the student averaged 1 course in which less work was done than in sociology. And so on.

Table F:5--Mean numbers of classes missed in sociology, by specific groups

	TOTAL	ARTS	ED.	OTHERS	MOST VERBAL	LEAST VERBAL
Experimental	6.9	6.1	8.2	6.4	7.4	6.0
Traditional	6.9	5.6	6.0	9.6	5.0	11.5

Table F:6--Mean number of books relating to sociology read during the year, by specific groups^(a)

	TOTAL	ARTS	ED.	OTHERS	MOST VERBAL	LEAST VERBAL
Experimental	4.7 (S=4.3)	3.8	5.8	3.5	3.5	3.3
Traditional	0.7 (S=1.1)	0.9	1.0	0.3	1.5	0.3

t=5.3
p<.0005

(a) Listings of the text (usually as "a couple of chapters") were counted as $\frac{1}{2}$ book. Regardless of the number, articles mentioned were counted as $\frac{1}{2}$ book.

Table F:7--Proportion of students planning to take future sociology course, by specific groups

	TOTAL (a)	ARTS (a)	ED. (a)	OTHER (a)	MOST (a) VERBAL	LEAST (a) VERBAL
Experimental Yes-34 (71%) Maybe-13 (27%)	0.84	0.77	0.79	0.97	0.86	0.61
Traditional Yes-29 (82%) Maybe- 3 (8%)	0.85	0.95	0.95	0.59	0.95	0.60

Z=1.99
p < .05

Z=1.94
p < .05

(Combining yes & maybe) $\chi^2 = 3.43$
p > .05

(a) In these groups, "maybe" was counted as 0.5, "yes" as 1.0 to give a maximum average score possible of 1.0.

Table F:8--Number of students "thinking about majoring in sociology" by specific groups

	TOTAL	ARTS	ED.	OTHER	MOST VERBAL	LEAST VERBAL
Experimental	15 (31%)	6 (40%)	4 (24%)	5 (31%)	8 (36%)	1 (11%)
Traditional	15 (42%)	9 (64%)	5 (45%)	1 (9%)	7 (64%)	1 (10%)

$\chi^2=4.3$
 $p < .05$

$\chi^2=6.4$
 $p < .05$

$$\chi^2=0.97$$

$$p > .30$$

Table F:9--Number of students stating that this year of university has resulted in a broader outlook in life, by specific groups (a)

	TOTAL	ARTS	ED.	OTHER	MOST VERBAL	LEAST VERBAL
Experimental	27 (56%)	9 (60%)	11 (65%)	7 (44%)	12 (55%)	5 (56%)
Traditional	16 (44%)	8 (57%)	6 (55%)	2 (18%)	3 (27%)	2 (20%)

$$\chi^2=1.15$$

$$p > .20$$

(a) Included in this category are responses indicating greater tolerance, "more philosophical outlook" etc., but not responses pertaining to self such as "have become more mature" etc.

Table F:10---Numbers of students who would advise future students in same class to get involved, by specific group(a)

	TOTAL	ARTS	ED.	OTHER	MOST VERBAL	LEAST VERBAL	
Experimental	28 (58%)	7 (47%)	9 (53%)	12 (75%)	12 (77%)	2 (22%)	$\chi^2=6.74$ $p < .01$
Traditional	8 (22%)	3 (21%)	3 (27%)	2 (18%)	4 (36%)	2 (20%)	$\chi^2=0.68$ $p > .30$

$$\chi^2=10.95$$

$$p < .001$$

(a) Given the nature of the two types of class, it was necessary to use different criteria in assigning subjects to this category. Students in the experimental class who would urge more extra reading (3), verbal participation in class (12), or both (13), were placed in this category. Students in the traditional class who would urge extra reading (2), attendance of seminars (4), or mental application of sociology ideas to everyday examples (2), were placed in this category. Only one of the students who would advise attendance of seminars would urge verbal participation in them, and that for "brownie points" and not because he really felt this was good advice.

APPENDIX G

EPILOGUE: CONTINUATION OF EXPERIMENTAL CLASSES

Table G:1 shows the "return rate" for each of the three experimental classes. Somewhat over half the students returned for a second year of the experimental course. About one-quarter of the students were unable to return, another one-quarter chose not too. More students in the Arts class than in the other two classes decided not to return. The reasons given by the Arts students who did not return were in most cases vague. A typical response was "I didn't really know what I was doing, I just registered for a bunch of courses". Len, one of the most verbal in the Arts class, agreed that he didn't think there would be enough serious work done in the course, when I suggested that this might be his reason. The only student I talked with in the Mixed class about his decision for not returning was Barry. He could take only one course in Arts and had decided to take a philosophy course to sharpen his powers for reasoning and arguing.

In total, 26 students from the three experimental classes returned for a second year of the experimental course which is to be run on the same principles as it was during the first year. The 25 students met together and decided to divide themselves into two groups: one which meets twice a week at noon for an hour-and-a-half each session, and one which meets once a week in the evening. The first group is composed of all 12 students from the original Mixed class, plus 6 of the students from the original Education class. The evening group is composed of all 5 students from the original Arts class plus

3 students from the original Education class.

Both groups have decided to study in rather structured ways. The noon group draw up a list of topics on the first day, and so far, (September and October) has been considering a series of related topics: drugs, hippies, youth-oriented music, sex norms, meditation, etc. Three speakers have been heard on these topics, one report has been made by a member of the class, and a visit to the police station is planned for the near future. The class has decided to read Huxley's Brave New World and The Reminiscences of Che Guevera. Plans have been made to work with the Native Friendship Centre and to study one of the poorer areas of town.

The evening group has spent all its time on the subject of crime. Several people have presented reports and some students have made plans to work directly with people being released from jail. This class is quieter than the noon group, for none of the most dominant leaders from last year are members of it. In the noon class there is Fred from the original Education class, plus a number of the most outspoken people from the original Mixed class. In both classes some time has been spent discussing the progress so far. There seems to be unanimous agreement that the experimental course this year is "going better" than it did last year.

Table G:1--Percentage of each class returning for second year of experimental course.

	Class			Total
	Arts N=15	Ed. N=17	Mixed N=16	
Returned for second year of experimental course	33	53	75	54
Known to be unable to return for second year of experimental course(a)	27	29	6	21
Did not return for second year of experimental course	40	18	19	25
Total	100	100	100	100

(a) These students had left the University or were in programs which did not allow the course to be taken as an option.



B29890